DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 123 759	EA 008 313

AUTHOR	Kluempke, Gerald J.
TITLE	An Analysis of Advisory Councils to the United States Office of Education.
PUB DATE	Mar 76
NOTE	140p.; Summary of a doctoral dissertation, George Washington University; Appendices E and F may reproduce poorly
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$7.35 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Advisory Committees; Doctoral Theses; *Educational Policy; Educational Research; *Federal Government; Federal Legislation; *Organizational Effectiveness; Policy Formation; Questionnaires; Role Conflict
IDENTIFIERS	*Office of Education

ABSTRACT

Questionnaire responses obtained from 64 percent of both the 216 members and the 14 directors of education advisory councils revealed membership characteristics, roles, and responsibilities, and obtained members' suggestions for strengthening the advisory council concept. The 16 statutory public advisory councils and committees serving the U.S. Office of Education on June 30, 1975, served as the basis of the study. Members' age, sex, area of employment, ethnic or racial group, political preference, education, personal income, length of service, and other characteristics and comments are analyzed; conclusions are drawn; and recommendations are made in the document. A comprehensive review of the literature includes material (related to federal hearings, reports, and legislation) that shows the historical development of advisory councils. The appendixes contain copies of the questionnaires and letters, public laws pertaining to advisory councils, education-related advisory councils established 1956-75, names and addresses of council executives, and a bibliography. (MLF)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED123759

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

AN ANALYSIS OF ADVISORY COUNCILS TO THE UNITED STATES OFFICE OF EDUCATION

March 1976

GERALD J. KLUEMPKE
3800 North Fairfax Drive
Arlington, Virginia 22203
(703) 527-6028 - (202) 376-8888

EA 008 313

This report is a summary of a doctoral dissertation which was presented to the faculty of The George Washington University, Washington, D.C. during the Spring term, 1976.

INTRODUCTION

In recent years there has been increased emphasis on using advisory committees to the Federal Government. These committees are used for a variety of purposes, but chiefly they are designed to tap the experience and knowledge of individuals who are willing to devote their time and energy to improve the administrative operations and programs of the Federal Government.

Advisory committees provide a means for involving citizens in the decision-making process. The most capable and experienced leaders in business, the professions, and in our society are frequently called upon to serve.

Sixteen statuatory public advisory councils and committees were serving the U.S. Office of Education on June 30, 1975. Members of these organizations are appointed by the President; the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; or the U.S. Commissioner of Education, and are required by law to advise these officials and/or the U.S. Congress.

The following advisory councils were serving the United States Office of Education on June 30th and serve as the basis of this study:

1. Accreditation and Institutional Eligibility, Advisory Committee on
2. Adult Education, National Advisory Council on

3. Bilingual, Advisory Committee on the Education of
4. Career Education, National Advisory Council for
5. Community Education, Advisory Committee for
6. Developing Institutions, Advisory Council on
7. Disadvantaged Children, National Advisory Council on the Education of
8. Education Professions Development, National Advisory Council on
9. Equality of Educational Opportunity, National Advisory Council on
10. Extension and Continuing Education, National Advisory Council on
11. Financial Aid to Students, Advisory Council on
12. Handicapped, National Advisory Council on the
13. Indian Education, National Advisory Council on
14. Supplementary Centers and Services, National Advisory Council on
15. Vocational Education, National Advisory Council on
16. Women's Educational Programs, National Advisory Council for

Advisory councils have contributed substantially to the effectiveness of the Federal Government; however, as the function of government has become more complex the role of advisory councils has become less clear. As a result of the rapid growth of councils, insufficient attention has been paid to their development. This paper, therefore, will mainly address itself to three questions: Who serves on advisory councils? (2) How do council members perceive their roles? and (3) How can advisory councils improve their effectiveness.

Although appointments to advisory committees are usually considered to be prestigious--members are sometimes asked to serve without being given a clear explanation of their role. This, according to Cronin and Thomas in a February 1971 article often leads to "frustration and ambiguity."[1]

Each year the Federal Government spends more than two million dollars on committees which are called upon to advise the U.S. Office of Education. In spite of this large expenditure, council members are sometimes appointed without being given adequate information, staff, and other resources required to accomplish the objectives stipulated in the legislation. As a result of these failures, committees are often looked upon as being unnecessary and expensive.

Advisory committee members complain that the Congress fails to consider their recommendations, and that programs are considered on political rather than educational merit.

Federal officials occasionally criticize the Congress for introducing councils that, in their opinion, are not needed and have reacted by failing to appoint members, refusing to provide adequate staffing and other resources, and by ignoring the recommendations submitted by the councils.

Advisory council members and governmental leaders are seeking to clarify the role and function of advisory councils. This study is designed to assist in this important effort.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The researcher employed the services of Xerox's Comprehensive Dissertation Query Service, Lockheed's Information Retrieval Service, and the Educational Research Information Center (ERIC) in an attempt to locate relevant research studies on such topics as "advisory council," "Committee," and "educational policy making."

This section of the report includes a comprehensive review of the literature on admisory councils. Five studies, one by Carl Marcy in 1945, another by David S. Brown in 1954, a third by Thomas E. Cronin and Norman C. Thomas in 1969, a fourth by Frank Popper in 1970, and a fifth by the National Academy of Sciences are foundational to this study, and, are therefore, included in this section.

The third section of this report, Historical Development of Educational Advisory Councils, includes literature related to federal hearings, reports, and legislation. It is included in a seperate section to show the historical development of advisory councils.

The 1945 Study of Presidential Commissions

In 1945 Columbia University released a study of Presidential advisory commissions by Carl Milton Marcy which addressed itself to the councils created between the years 1900 and 1940.[1] The report was divided into nine major sections: (1) the importance of Presidential commissions, (2) the legal basis of Presidential commissions, (3) methods of appointing and financing Presidential commissions, (4) fact-finding and opinion-guiding commissions, (5) boards of inquiry, (6) procedure of Presidential commissions, and (7) the future of Presidential commissions.

---

[1] Carl Milton Marcy, Presidential Commissions (New York: King's Crown Press, 1945).

According to Marcy there were seven sources of Presidential authority for the creation of commissions at the time his research was conducted. These included the President's (1) responsibility to take care that the laws be faithfully executed, (2) power to establish a cabinet, (3) authority as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, (4) authority to use war and emergency powers, (5) position of chief foreign agent, (6) authority given by special Congressional grant, and (7) authority given under a general grant of power by the Congress.[1]

Marcy pointed out that his research suggests the wisdom of giving greater consideration to the "more frequent use of the capacities of men of recognized ability, experience, and fairness."[2] He suggests that this need is especially called for in times when pressure groups have strength enough to bend many Congressmen and government officials to their will. He said "It has often been noted that our government system does not make the best use of the experience of the outstanding men of our day."[2]

"For too long the idea has been generally accepted that the executive branch can get along without reorganizational changes until it begins to creak and groan...." Marcy said. He emphasized that reorganization of administrative practices of the government should be a constant process. To some extent, he pointed out, the Bureau of the Budget serves that purpose, but it tends to be immersed in administrative detail, which although important, leaves administration on the grand scale unattended." This job, he said, can best be done by Presidential commissions.[3]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 4

[2] Ibid., p. 69

[3] Ibid., p. 88

The 1954 Study of the Public Advisory Board in the Federal Government

In October 1954, Dr. David Brown, who is presently a Professor of Public Administration at The George Washington University, Washington, D.C., submitted a dissertation, entitled "The Public Advisory Board in the Federal Government," to the faculty of the Graduate School of Syracuse University.[1]

Dr. Brown's dissertation, the only comprehensive study of the advisory council process to date, analyzes the "organization, functions, activities and relationships" of the Public Advisory Board of the Economic Cooperation Administration. In the Introduction to Dr. Brown's report, he points out that "In spite of the growing interest in advisory boards in the Federal Government, there has been no overall examination of the subject within the government itself."[2] Furthermore, he emphasized that "Most of the material on advisory boards is unorganized and, of course, widely dispersed among agencies."[3] This statement appears to be just as accurate in 1975 as it was more than 20 years ago when Dr. Brown reported his findings.

Viewpoints of the various administrators and members of the Public Advisory Board of the Economic Cooperation Administration and the character of the Board under various leaders were major items of concern in Dr. Brown's study. The study also emphasized the administration, organization and staffing of the Board.[4]

---

[1] David S. Brown, "The Public Advisory Board in the Federal Government" (Ph.D. dissertation, Syracuse University, 1954).

[2] Ibid., p. 1.

[3] Ibid., p. 4.

[4] Ibid., p. 1.

In his concluding statement, Dr. Brown pointed out that (1) members of Congress sometimes see advisory boards as a means of curbing administrators and sometimes as a means of encouraging them, (2) an administrator may regard a board as a means of "selling" his program to the country, (3) the representatives of interested groups who are invited to sit on advisory boards value these invitations because it gives them the opportunity to discuss important problems within the framework of government, and (4) some members of the public fear the bureaucracy and, therefore, have great faith in advisory boards.[1]

The 1969 Study of Educational Policy Advisers

In 1969, Dr. Thomas E. Cronin, then a research political scientist at the Brookings Institution in Washington, D.C., and Dr. Norman C. Thomas, a professor of political science at Duke University in Durham, North Carolina, undertook a study which examined the individual role definitions and the personal attitudes toward advisory processes of the members of 26 councils and committees which were advising the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare during the years 1966 to 1969.

The focus of the study was on educational policy. Most of the data presented in the study, which was presented in a February 26, 1971, article in Science, resulted from a questionnaire which the researchers mailed to citizens serving on 26 educational advisory councils in early 1969. The authors gave the following report of their findings:

---

[1] Ibid., p. 449-454.

> Approximately 60 percent of the sample held doctoral degrees, more than 80 percent were teachers or educational administrators, and 88 percent were over 40 years old. Fifty-seven percent said they were Democrats, as opposed to 12 percent who said they were Republicans, and almost all the respondents said they favored an active federal government role in education and the domestic program initiatives of the Great Society. Most of the respondents viewed themselves as educational policy makers, or at least as educational researchers and civic leaders knowledgeable about education.[1]

In summary, Drs. Cronin and Thomas recommended: (1) that government officials specify as precisely as possible the exact function or functions of councils, (2) more thoughtful Congressional appreciation of advisory councils, (3) that advisory councils should not be established if staffing must be inadequate and meeting time insufficient, (4) that the membership composition be designed in the light of the specified functions the council is expected to serve, and (5) that since a spectrum of options concerning advisory councils is available to federal officials no one format should become fixed as the model.[2]

The 1972 Report on Advisory Committees to the National Academy of Sciences

In 1968 the National Academy of Science formed a special study commission entitled Committee on the Utilization of Young Scientists and Engineers in Advisory Services to Government for the purpose of examining the question of selecting members for Academy advisory committees. The major objective of the study committee was to determine how councils could more effectively recruit and appoint young scientists to membership on Academy committees; however, the commission, which released its report in 1972, broadened its study to include other significant questions regarding the status of advisory committees.[1]

---

[1] Thomas E. Cronin and Norman C. Thomas, "Federal Advisory Processes: Advice and Discontent," Science, February 26, 1971, p. 771.

[2] Ibid.

If a committee fails to "achieve its best," according to the report, it can usually be understood by reference to one or a combination of the following: administrative weaknesses in the requesting, appointing, or supporting machinery; the nature of the task assigned to the committee; the conditions under which the committee has to work; or deficiencies among the members themselves.[2]

The following are some of the recommendations made in the committee report:

1. That the nominal term of service on a continuing committee be not more than three years and that extension be given only infrequently and for compelling reasons.

2. That proposing and appointing agencies internally review the status of every committee at least once each year, ask themselves why the committee should not be terminated, and act promptly and decisively if they do not find convincing answers.

3. That federal agencies and private foundations give support to well-planned and imaginative research projects by competent investigators in the area of committee process, small-group dynamics, and the advisory function.

4. That greater precision and descriptiveness be used in the nomenclature for science committees.

---

[1] National Academy of Sciences, The Science Committee (Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Sciences, 1972) p. iv.

[2] Ibid., p. 5.

5. That appointing agencies throw the net more widely in seeking nominees for committee service; particularly, that more younger people (35 years old and younger), women, and members of ethnic minorities be included in committee memberships; and specifically, that every committee, unless there is compelling reason to the contrary, include at least one younger person of ability and promise as a way of providing experience and education for the oncoming generation of advisers.

6. That committee memberships be balanced so as to include both experienced, seasoned people and those newer to committee work, so that opportunities exist for progression in committee service.

7. That the larger appointing agencies, such as the National Research Council and the larger federal agencies, assign to central offices the responsibility of finding qualified persons for committee assignments.

8. That sponsoring agencies experiment with conferences on topics of special interest and potential significance, which often lead to important committee studies, stimulate interest in committee service, and serve to identify highly motivated people with the potential of becoming unusually able advisers.

9. That appointing agencies clearly define the functions of committees, prepare guidelines for the conduct of committee activities, and see that every member is acquainted with them.

10. That the performance and justification for continuance of committees be evaluated regularly and frequently by the sponsoring agencies and by the committee members.

11. That sponsoring agencies provide timely and adequate supporting services so that each committee can make the most effective use of its members' time and energies.

12. That sponsoring agencies make determined efforts to keep committee members informed about the results of their work, such as decisions taken or difficulties encountered, policy changes, awards made, and new programs or institutions created. Such feedback should continue during the lifetime of the committee and for a reasonable period after its discharge.

13. That sponsoring agencies pay greater attention to recognition of committee service.

14. That an ethic of committee service be generally accepted: A person should serve as a member of a committee only if he is convinced of the value of the advisory task and is able to provide the time and effort that it requires.[1]

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 9-24.

According to the National Academy of Sciences report the government now relies heavily on the advice of committees; therefore, the "health and effectiveness of the advisory structure should be a matter of concern throughout government at all levels of executive and legislative responsibility.[1]

The authors of the report point out that related to the task of keeping a continuing committee fresh and independent in its viewpoint is the crucial problem of terminating it. They say:

> Committees develop lives of their own. Even with periodic influxes of new members, they can dig ruts that unnecessarily limit their scope and effectiveness. In general, it is much more difficult to terminate a committee than to form one. Even ad hoc committees have been known to continue long after the tasks for which they were originally created have been completed. Sometimes, of course, long life for a committee is desirable. Examples can be cited of committees that have remained lively, creative, critical, and useful for many years. By the same token, there are examples of moribund committees that have finally been terminated and unlamented, or that have been replaced by new committees under new leadership that has then succeeded in pumping fresh life into programs of great importance. The greatest wrong is to continue a committee out of administrative lethargy or out of reluctance to put an end to it when its real value no longer makes its continuation worthwhile.[2]

The report concludes that "the most important steps that can be taken to renew the vitality of the system and to reinforce its effectiveness lie in the area of selection and recruitment." The authors suggest several methods of identifying potential members: the "snowball techniques," whereby selected persons nominate colleagues who would in turn be requested to nominate other colleagues, compilation of a roster of nominators, use of records of research grants, use of lists of recipients of prestigious fellowships or other awards, solicitation of nominees from professional societies and the heads of graduate schools, and review the lists of those who have already served on committees.[1]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 7.

[2] Ibid., p. 8.

Periodicals and Books

Most of the literature on advisory councils is concerned with the activities of a particular council. Very little material has been written about the activities, roles, and responsibilities of groups of councils.

In 1970 the Twentieth Century Fund released a report by Frank Popper who researched Presidential commissions. Although Mr. Popper's research was restricted to Presidential commissions, his report offers insightful comments on the strengths and weaknesses of commissions.

In response to the question "Why commissions?" Mr. Popper points out that all Presidents need disinterested expert advice to "supplement the narrow view of federal agencies, Congress, the press, local governments, and interest groups." For this reason, he says, Presidents have frequently turned to commissions--ad hoc, nonpartisan groups of men not involved in the day to day operation of the government.[2]

Presidential commissions, according to Popper, "do not form a clique, but, with their other public responsibilities with their access to print and publicity, and with their positions, directorships, awards, club memberships, and honorary degrees, they are more like each other than they are like their constituents." He further suggests that most members are administrators who are "used to working in committees."[1]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 16.

[2] Frank Popper, The President's Commissions (New York: Twentieth Century Fund, 1970) p. 5.

On the subject of how commissions function Mr. Popper says:

> The task force collects notions--good, bad, and indifferent--from its members. Some have been around for a long time and never tried--they may have been in reports of the task forces four years back, and even eight years back--and some are being tried on a small scale, and some are being tried somewhere in the recesses of the government and the task force doesn't even know about it (but that's not too likely). And the ideas come from everywhere.... The task force is like a huge broom--it picks up ideas that are around, does some brief and crude initial evaluation, and puts it down in its report.[2]

The role of the executive director of a council is a difficult one according to Popper. He says that once the director has hired his staff he is caught in the middle between the commissioners and the staff. He points out that "Commissioners, staff members, and directors all describe commission-staff relations as 'acerbic,' 'tense,' and 'guarded.'"[3]

This position is reinforced in an article by Elizabeth Drew entitled, "On Giving Oneself a Hotfoot: Government by Commissions." She says:

> The staff is often composed of young, less experienced people who think the world can and should be changed; the commissioners know better.... So the policy alternatives go up from the staff, and policy directives come down from the commissioners, and seldom the twain meet, except in the person of the exhausted whipsawed executive director."[4]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 18.

[2] Ibid., p. 23.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Elizabeth B. Drew, "On Giving Oneself A Hotfoot: Government by Commissions," Atlantic Monthly, May 1968, p. 45.

Popper says that "On any commission, the executive director must, as one staff member said, 'be good at getting compliance or silence from people while pretending to get their advice.'" He further states that the executive director must prevent the commissioners from taking the commission in contradictory or irrelevant directions. According to Potter the executive director:

> ...has the nearly impossible task of making commissioners and staff members regard the commission as a cohesive group, and not as a fragmented and temporary collection of individuals. But, above all, he must infuse both the commissioners and the staff with a sense of urgency.[1]

An interesting insight into the difficulties of working within the constraints of the Federal Government is offered by Adam Yarmolinsky in an article entitled "Ideas into Programs." He says:

> The bureaucrat's constant concern is to keep the system moving, and he, more than anyone else, is aware of its enormous inertia, and the difficulty of changing course or starting up again if it is stopped even momentarily. Bureaucrats realize better than anyone else how difficult it is to get anything done in government, and they adopt the devices of routinizing and systematizing—and bureaucratizing if you will--in order that certain things, at least, will be done.[2]

A 1972 editorial in U.S. News and World Report quotes Alexander Heard, Chancellor of Vanderbilt University and advisor to Mr. Nixon on education affairs as saying that people expect advisory commissions to come up with an instant solution to a complex problem nobody else has managed to solve. According to the article Mr. Heard said: "I think the test is what contribution does the study commission make to the education of the nation as a whole and of public officials--What kinds of ideas does it stimulate on issues, how much forward does it advance consideration of problems and steps toward solution?"[1]

---

[1] Frank Popper, The President's Commissions (New York: Twentieth Century Fund, 1970) p. 5.

[2] Adam Yarmolinsky, "Ideas into Programs," in The Presidential Advisory System, ed. Thomas E. Cronin and Sanford D. Greenberg (New York: Harper & Row, 1969) p. 92.

Much of the literature on advisory councils emphasizes the importance of selecting capable people who are willing to devote their time and energies to council activities. The importance of a President surrounding himself with capable people was emphasized in 1969 by Thomas E. Cronin in The President's Commissions when he said: "A President committed to excellence in education and seeking to strengthen his leadership in the educational policy system has many resources, but none is more important than attracting qualified people for top government posts and key advisory spots."[2]

In "The Policy Makers and the Intellectual" Henry Kissinger offered the following insights on what he considered to be a major deficiency of advisory councils:

> ...Many organizations, governmental or private, rely on panels of experts. Political leaders have intellectuals as advisors. Throughout our society, policy-planning bodies proliferate. Research organizations multiply. The need for talent is a theme of countless reports. What, then, is the difficulty?
>
> One problem is the demand for expertise itself. Every problem which our society becomes concerned about--leaving aside the question of whether these are always the most significant--calls into being panels, committees, or study groups supported by either private or governmental funds.

---

[1] "Washington Worry: All Those Advisors," U.S. News & World Report, July 17, 1972, p. 79-80.

[2] Thomas E. Cronin, "The Presidency and Education," in The Presidential Advisory System, edds. Thomas E. Cronin and Sanford D. Greenberg (New York: Harper & Row, 1969) p. 229.

> Many organizations constantly call on intellectuals for advice. As a result, intellectuals with a reputation soon find themselves so burdened that their pace of life hardly differs from that of the executives whom they counsel. They cannot supply perspective because they are as harassed as the policy makers. All pressures on them tend to keep them at the level of the performance which gained them their reputation. In his desire to be helpful, the intellectual is too frequently compelled to sacrifice what should be his greatest contribution to society--his creativity.[1]

In recent years the Federal Government has become deeply involved in American Education. As a result of the Higher Education Act and the Elementary and Secondary Acts, it would be difficult to find a classroom that is not in some way affected by the government's interest and financial assistance. As a result of this commitment to better education more and more people have been involved in determining education policy. James Bryant Conant was critical of the methods used in shaping education policy in 1964 when he said:

> As we have seen, educational policy in the United States has been determined in the past by the more or less haphazard interaction of (1) the leaders of public school teachers, administrators, and professors of education, (2) state education authorities, (3) a multitude of state colleges and universities, (4) private colleges and universities, and (5) the variety of agencies of the Federal Government, through which vast sums of money have flowed to individual institutions and the states.
>
> It is my thesis that much a jumble of influential private and public bodies does not correspond to the needs of the nation in the 1960's. Some degree of order needs to be brought out of this chaos, primarily for the benefit of the on-coming generation, but also, to achieve a more effective use of public and private moneys.[2]

---

[1] Henry A. Kissenger, "The Policy Makers and the Intellectual," in The Presidential Advisory System, edds. Thomas E. Cronin and Sanford D. Greenberg (New York: Harper & Row, 1969) p. 162-163.

[2] James B. Conant, Shaping Educational Policy (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964).

Representative Albert H. Quie (R., Minn.) in "The View from the Hill" an article printed in The Future in the Making, a publication of the American Association for Higher Education, was also critical of the performance of the education community in providing the Congress with needed information. The ranking member of the Education and Labor Committee said:

> Members of the higher education community are probably well aware of the criticism Congress has leveled at higher education in recent months. The criticism comes mainly from members of Congress who were most involved in the three-year consideration of the Education Amendments of 1972, signed into law last June. We found that there was very little discussion within the higher education community about legislation. The few who communicated with Congress provided us too little information, and when they did it was not at the time we needed it most. One key member of our Education and Labor Committee with close ties to many universities has said publicly that he was absolutely embarrassed by the scope and quality of information provided by the higher education community. It seemed to me the major educational associations chose to concentrate on the politics of getting one particular formula for institutional aid adopted, while leaving most of the necessary data-gathering and analytical work to the Congress.[1]

Education advisory councils are frequently called upon to testify before the Congress on matters relating to legislation and appropriations. The views of the members are usually welcomed by the Congress because of the advisory councils' unique role in federal affairs. Members are "insiders on the outside" representing various viewpoints which are periodically researched, analyzed, and coalesced for various reports and statements.

Not all members of councils have professional training in the areas they serve the government. The advantage of a council obtaining a "public members" viewpoint was summarized by Dr. David S. Brown when he testified before the Senate hearings on advisory councils:

---

[1] Albert H. Quie, "The View from the Hill," in The Future in the Making, ed. Dyckman W. Vermilye (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1973) p. 3-4.

> I would like to share with this committee my own experience as a public member of a select committee in the Office of Education several years ago. We were dealing with the subject of school guidance and counseling programs about which at the time I had very little specific knowledge. I explained this to those who asked me to serve and was assured that this was one of the reasons for my choice. As the meetings progressed, however, I began to realize that I and the other two 'public members were performing a useful service by focusing upon points which there was disagreement among the experts, calling attention to the significant public issues involved, and on a number of occasions helping to achieve a consensus by the types of questions we asked and the manner in which we sought to bring the varying views together.' I am pleased to report how well I felt about my assignment, and how well I think my associates felt about having me and the other public members there.[1]

For the purpose of this study, education advisory councils have been defined as those councils which are advisory to programs of the U.S. Office of Education. Many councils serving other agencies of the Federal Government, however, are also education oriented. The following councils are examples of councils serving other agencies: (1) the National Advisory Council on Child Nutrition of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, (2) the National Advisory Council on Health Professions Education of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and (3) the Advisory Committee for Science Education of the National Science Foundation.[2]

In the field of international education, there were eleven information and educational exchange advisory councils at the beginning of 1973. The number was reduced to eight in 1975 according to testimony in April 1975 on the Role of Advisory Councils in Foreign Policy.[1]

---

[1] U.S. Congress, Senate, Hearings before the Subcommittee on Inter-Governmental Relations of the Committee on Government Operations of the U.S. Senate, 91st Cong., 2d sess., 1970.

[2] U.S. President, Federal Advisory Committees (Washington, D.C., Government Printing Office, March 1975).

In presenting testimony for the State Department, a representative said:

> The relatively large number of advisory committees in this field is probably accounted for by two factors. First, the major legislation in the field established some advisory committees and authorized the appointment of additional ones as deemed necessary by the executive branch. Second, the programs deal with the public and involve matters not directly related to the formulation of foreign policy, making them particularly suitable for the use of advisory committees.[2]

Although the Federal Government spends well over $75 million annually on advisory councils, the subject remains a relatively underresearched function of government. Nearly every researcher on the topic including Carl Marcy in the 1940's, David Brown in the 1950's, and Thomas Cronin in the 1960's has called for greater attention to the topic. Recent emphasis on government reports, the passage of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, and an upswing in public interest indicates that the subject will be given much more attention during the next decade.

---

[1] U.S. Senate, Committee on Foreign Relations, The Role of Advisory Committees in U.S. Foreign Policy (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, April 1975).

[2] Ibid.

HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT
OF EDUCATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCILS

The first federal advisory commission was appointed by President George Washington in 1794 to settle "The Whiskey Rebellion," an uprising of Pennsylvania distillers against the federal liquor tax.[1]

During the 19th century most Presidents sought the advice of commissions. President Van Buren, for example, appointed a number of important commissions including one which studied the European postal system. Commissions, however, did not play a major role in government until 1901 when Theodore Roosevelt became President.[2]

President Roosevelt appointed a number of commissions to make legislative proposals more palatable to the Congress. The Aldrich Commission, which led to the establishment of the Federal Reserve System was probably the best known of the Roosevelt Commissions. A special report for the Library of Congress, entitled, Federal Commissions, Committees and Boards lists 490 Presidential Committees for the period beginning with Roosevelt's Presidency in 1901 and continuing through Calvin Coolidge's term which ended in 1929. The summary is included in Table 1, Page 21.[1]

---

[1] Thomas E. Cronin and Sanford D. Greenberg, The Presidential Advisory System (New York: Harper and Row, 1969) p. 7.

[2] Library of Congress, Federal Commissions, Committees and Boards (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, n.d.) p. 132.

TABLE 1

Presidential Commissions, Committees and Boards for the Period 1901-1929

President	Term	Number of Committees
Theodore Roosevelt	1901-1905	37
Theodore Roosevelt	1905-1909	70
William H. Taft	1909-1913	63
Thomas W. Wilson	1913-1917	64
Thomas W. Wilson	1917-1921	96
Warren G. Harding	1921-1923	44
John C. Coolidge	1923-1925	43
John C. Coolidge	1925-1929	75
Total		492

On February 23, 1917 President Wilson signed into law federal legislation on vocational education which provided for a Federal Board for Vocational Education designed to (1) promote vocational education in agriculture, the trades, and industries, (2) cooperate with the states in the preparation of teachers of vocational subjects, and (3) regulate the expenditure of money appropriated by the act.[2]

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Ibid.

The board consisted of the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Labor, the U.S. Commissioner of Education, and three citizens of the U.S. appointed by the President by and with the consent of the Senate. One of the "citizen" members was to be a representative of the manufacturing and commercial interests, another was to represent agriculture, and the other labor.[1]

The provisions of the Federal Board for Vocational Education which called for "citizen" participation formed the framework for many advisory councils which were to be appointed during the Presidencies of John Kennedy, Lyndon Johnson, and Richard Nixon.

Although the U.S. Office of Education came into existence on March 2, 1867, when President Johnson signed into law "An Act to Establish a Department of Education," it played a rather insignificant role in educational affairs because of the strong feeling among many Americans that the Federal Government should not "meddle" in education affairs. Most citizens and legislators considered education to be a function of the individual states and were strongly opposed to any attempt by the Federal Government to usurp the role assumed by local and state education agencies.

In The Unfinished Journey, Issues In American Education by the John Day Company, the early role of the U.S. Office of Education is discussed as follows:

> Actually Congress voted the new department only $25,000 for its first year of operation. Henry Barnard, the first Commissioner of Education, received a salary of $4,000. Two years later his salary was reduced by the Congress to

---

[1] Ibid.

> $3,000, and his staff was cut to two. The Department of Education became the Office of Education and was quietly submerged in the Department of the Interior under a secretary whose immediate predecessor had observed, 'there is no necessity of anyone knowing anything whatever about education.' There it remained until 1939 when it was transferred to the now-defunct Federal Security Agency, an asylum for waif and orphan offices and bureaus of the government. In 1953 the Office of Education found its present home in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.[1]

The establishment of the Federal Board for Vocational Education did not trigger a change in national education policy. Although public officials frequently praised the schools, they continued to emphasize the strong local role. On February 25, 1926, President Hoover made the following comments to the National Education Association.

> About one-fourth of the whole population of our country is always simultaneously engaged in the same occupation--the job of going to school. It is the largest group in any one employment. To use a term of Ceasar, it is truly a "gainful occupation." Moreover, as nearly the whole people have worked at it at one time or another, no matter how diverse their life may become, they all have a common memory of the schoolyard and the classroom, and they all have a lasting affection for some teacher.[2]

The question of a Federal Department of Education was a concern of many Americans in the nineteen twenties and on June 6, 1929, President Hoover appointed a citizen's committee of leading educators to consider the question. The committee reported on November 16, 1931. The committee's opinions on the Department question were divided but it was emphatic that the Federal Government should not invade the public schools. [3]

---

[1] The John Day Company, The Unfinished Journey: Issues in American Education (New York: The John Day Company, 1968) pp. 14-15.

[2] Roy Lyman Wilbur and Arthur Mastick Hyde, The Hoover Policies (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1937) p. 75.

[3] Ibid., p. 79.

The 52-person committee had been asked by President Hoover to make the "first comprehensive survey of federal educational activities." The following recommendations were made by the committee in its October 1931 report: (1) the immediate creation of a Department of Education to coordinate federal education programs; (2) further studies by the Office of Education to determine whether federal financial support for education was needed; and (3) elimination of special education grants, especially those for vocational education. If vocational education was to be subsidized, the committee reported that it should be supported by general federal grants used at the discretion of the states. In response to the committee's report President Hoover took the following action, according to Frank J. Munger and Richard F. Fenno., Jr., in National Politics and Federal Aid to Education:

> Of all the recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Education, President Hoover chose only to follow the suggestion that the vocational education program be terminated. As a part of his economy program to meet the economic crisis, he suggested in 1932 that all vocational funds be suspended for one year. This proposal was rejected by Congress. The struggle was renewed by his successor, President Franklin Roosevelt who also sought to reduce appropriations for vocational education in the states. Instead of accepting Roosevelt's proposed reductions, Congress sought an increase, and in 1936 passed a measure enlarging the appropriation. President Roosevelt signed the bill....[1]

In 1936 President Roosevelt appointed a Committee on Vocational Education to review the vocational education program. The committee was later re-named the Advisory Committee on Education and given jurisdiction over all aspects of the relationship between the Federal Government and education.[1]

---

[1] Frank J. Munger and Richard F. Fenno, Jr., National Politics and Federal Aid to Education (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1962) pp. 100-101.

The advisory committee submitted its report in February 1938 recommending a program of federal aid to education that would have amounted to $140 million in general aid by the sixth year, plus $62 million in various special grants. President Roosevelt accepted the council's report but did not endorse it.[2]

Federal aid to education was a major issue in the thirties because of the depression. The forties, however, brought World War II and America's preoccupation with winning a war. In 1948 President Truman sponsored the first White House Conference on Education which was the forerunner for conferences in the Eisenhower and Johnson Presidencies.

The friends of federal aid to education in attendance at the 1955 White House Conference on Education won an unexpected victory when President Eisenhower proposed a school construction program. According to Munger and Fenno the presidential proposals were relatively complicated in character, involving three alternative forms of assistance—purchase of local school bonds, federal backing for the bonds of state school building authorities, and, where nothing else would work, federal matching grants. The N.E.A. and other educational groups objected to the form of the education bill, protesting both that it provided too little federal assistance and that it imposed too many conditions on the aid authorized. Accordingly, the mid-fifties witnessed a series of annual struggles among supporters of different kinds of school construction bills.[1]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 100.

[2] Ibid.

In 1965 the White House again sponsored a conference on education. The conference was described as follows by Senator Wayne Morse, chairman of the Subcommittee on Education of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

> The White House Conference on Education called by President Johnson, July 20-21, may well be a milestone in the history of education. The scope of the area of concern for the conference ranged from preschool education through postgraduate research. The discussion spared the gamut of educational problems from education of the handicapped and disadvantaged to education of the talented. The objective of the conference was to bring together approximately 500 American citizens, from the ranks of the professional educators, government, and the American public to ponder and discuss the problems and promise of American education. The emphasis was on innovation.[2]

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] U.S. Senate, Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. White House Conference on Education: A Milestone for Educational Progress (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, August 1965) p. v.

The 1959 Executive Order on Advisory Committees

In 1957 the Government Operations Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives held hearings on advisory councils and reported on a bill, H.R. 7390, which contained various measures of control over the creation and utilization of committees. The bill died in the Senate; however, the "Senate Government Operations Committee, in lieu of acting on the bill, encouraged the Bureau of the Budget to review operations of advisory committees in the executive branch and report back to the committee."[1] The study report, "Standards and Procedures for the Utilization of Public Advisory Committees by Government Departments and Agencies," released on February 2, 1959 was used as the framework for Executive Order No. 11007, released by President John F. Kennedy on February 26, 1962.[2]

The Sixties--A New Era for Education Advisory Councils

In 1960, John W. Gardner, then President of the Carnegie Corporation, became chairman of the "Task Force on Education" of President Eisenhower's Commission on National Goals. Gardner contended that education was the key to improving the "quality of life in the American society."[3] As chairman of the task force on education, he became one of the nation's leading supporters of federal aid to education.

---

[1] Hearings before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations of the U.S. House of Representatives, 91st Congress, 2nd Sess. (1970) p. 41.

[2] Stephen K. Bailey and Edith K. Mosher, ESEA, The Office of Education Administers A Law (New York: Syracuse University Press, 1968) p. 6.

[3] Ibid.

Stephen K. Bailey and Edith K. Mosher describe this important period in developing national education policy as follows:

> In the field of federal school aid, the half decade 1960-64 was filled with political inventiveness and some major breakthroughs in cognote legislative areas....
>
> The decade began with a presidential campaign which pitted the Eisenhower-Nixon philosophy of indirect aid-for-school-construction-only against the Kennedy-Democratic-Congressional philosophy of general aid for both school construction and teachers' salaries. The Presidential victory of Senator John F. Kennedy, Democrat of Massachusetts, in November 1960, presaged the beginning of a struggle whose resolution was ultimately to be the Johnson Administration's triumph of ESEA.[1]

In the summer of 1964 President Johnson appointed the Task Force on Education which was chaired by John Gardner. The task force was asked neither to resolve basic conflicts nor to write legislation but to bring together varying streams of educational thought to form the basis of a fresh dialogue. According to a report prepared for the Subcommittee on Education, of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the U.S. Senate, the task force was instructed "to 'think big' without public constraint or professional bias."[2]

Cronin and Greenberg gave the following insights into President Kennedy's use of Commissions in The Presidential Advisory System:

> President John F. Kennedy was very fond of using task forces, particularly for promoting and refining provocative new projects. He viewed these as part of the 'theater of government' and did not appear to mind if they called for legislative action which went beyond that which he knew he could

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] U.S. Congress, Senate, Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Notes and Working Papers Concerning the Administration of Programs Authorized Under Title III of Public Law 89-10, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 As Amended by Public Law 89-750, 90th Cong., 1st sess. (1967) p. 15.

> secure. Kennedy valued the task force process both for long-range planning and for educating more people to the major problems that faced our government. He enjoyed meeting with the outside task forces and was clearly at home among their participants.[1]

The passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in April 1965, which resulted in part from the work of the task force, provided for the appointment of three advisory councils: (1) the National Advisory Council on the Education of the Disadvantaged, (2) the Advisory Committee on Supplementary Centers and Services, and (3) the Advisory Council on State Departments of Education. Members were appointed to these councils by President Johnson on April 11, 1965.

The Higher Education Act (1964), the Economic Opportunity Act (1964), and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (1965) encouraged citizen involvement in government through active participation on committees and councils. Members were appointed to an unprecedented fourteen education councils during 1965 alone (see Appendix G).

Cronin and Thomas suggest that "two significant developments during the 1960s resulted in the proliferation of advisory bodies at all levels of American government." They describe these developments as follows:

> First, expansion of federal domestic programs into all aspects of American life prompted a demand for better understanding of "real needs" and better indicators of program impact. Secondly, with the coming of "the war on poverty" and the pursuit of "the Great Society," it was generally held that all sectors of society must be taken into account, consulted, involved, and, above all, "listend to." As

---

[1] Thomas E. Cronin and Sanford D. Greenberg, The Presidential Advisory System (New York: Harper and Row, 1969) p. xvi.

> the Great Society's legislation on education moved to a series of successful triumphs on Capitol Hill, the Johnson administration established council after council to review progress on programs, develop suggestions for their expansion, and assess their effectiveness.[1]

In 1968 the U.S. Office of Education published Public Advisory Committees which showed a substantial increase in the number of councils during President Johnson's administration. The names and addresses of 250 members and descriptions of the following councils were included in the publication:[2]

1. Accreditation and Institutional Eligibility, Advisory Committee on
2. Adult Basic Education, National Advisory Committee on
3. College Library Resources, Advisory Council on
4. Developing Institutions, Advisory Council on
5. Educational Laboratories, National Advisory Committee on
6. Education of Disadvantaged Children, National Advisory Council on
7. Education Professions Development, National Advisory Council on
8. Evaluation of Training in Vocational Schools, Advisory Committee for the
9. Exchange of Teachers, National Advisory Committee for the
10. Extension and Continuing Education, National Advisory Council on
11. Graduate Education, Advisory Committee on
12. Graduate Fellowship Program, Advisory Committee on the National Defense

---

[1] Thomas E. Cronin and Norman C. Thomas, Educational Policy Advisors and The Great Society (Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1970) p. 559.

[2] U.S. Office of Education, Public Advisory Committees (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1968).

13. Guidance and Counseling, Advisory Committee on
14. Handicapped Children, National Advisory Committee on
15. Health Occupations Training, National Advisory Committee on
16. Instructional Technology, Commission on
17. Insured Loans to Students, Advisory Council on
18. Insured Loans to Vocational Students, Advisory Council on
19. Library Research and Training Projects, Advisory Committee on
20. Mexican-American Education, Advisory Committee on
21. Publication of Copyrighted Materials, Advisory Committee on the
22. Research Advisory Council
23. State Departments of Education, Advisory Council on
24. Supplementary Centers and Services, National Advisory Council on
25. Teacher Corps, Advisory Committee on the
26. Vocational Education, Advisory Committee on

Only seven of the 26 councils described in Public Advisory Committees were in operation on October 1, 1975. The seven remaining included: (1) Accreditation and Institutional Eligibility, (2) Developing Institutions, (3) Education of Disadvantaged Children, (4) Education Professions Development, (5) Extension and Continuing Education, (6) Handicapped Children, and (7) Vocational Education.

General Provisions Concerning Education Act

On April 13, 1970 President Nixon signed the General Provisions Concerning Education Act which required the U.S. Office of Education to follow certain policies relating to program planning and evaluation, the collection and dissemination of information, and criteria on the operation and administration of advisory councils.[1]

The section on advisory councils authorized the Commissioner "to create, and appoint members of, such advisory councils as he determines in writing to be necessary...." The legislation further stipulated that the Commissioner could use these councils for advice concerning (1) the organization of the Office of Education and its conduct in the administration of applicable programs, (2) for legislation regarding education programs and the means by which the educational needs of the nation may be met, and (3) to get advice on special problems and areas of special interest in education.[2]

The Act (1) requires the Commissioner to report annually on advisory councils, (2) stipulates that councils shall report by March 31 of each year, (3) establishes guidelines for the compensation of advisory council members and staff, (4) requires councils to meet "not less than two times each year," and (5) requires written minutes of each meeting.[3] (See Appendix E.)

Federal Advisory Committee Act

The Federal Advisory Committee Act was drafted following hearings which took place in the House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate during 1970 and 1971. The hearings, which began in the House of Representatives, were conducted before the Special Studies Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, chaired by Representative John S. Monagan, a Democrat from Connecticut.

---

[1] General Provisions Concerning Education Act, Public Law 91-230, Sec. 401(a) (10), 84 Stat. 171 (1970).

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid.

In opening the hearings, Chairman Monagan said:

> The hearings stem from a preliminary study by the subcommittee staff which concluded that it is virtually impossible to compile a complete list of Presidential committees because the methods of creating Presidential committees range from the formality of an Act of Congress or an Executive Order to the informality of an oral conversation and there is no index or directory of such committees. The Committee on Government Operations is charged with overseeing the efficiency and economy of operation of the departments and agencies of the executive branch of the Government....
>
> The role of the council, committee, or commission as a governmental advisory function in the operation of the executive branch of the U.S. Government has never been fully reviewed. The theory underlying the use of advisory committees appears to be fundamentally sound. However, a review is warranted to assure that the advisory committees are efficiently utilized and their activities are directed to legitimate objectives.[1]

During the hearings, which began on March 12, 1970, the subcommittee received testimony from seven witnesses. Mr. George Fortwengler, Supervisory Systems Accountant from the General Accounting Office, was the first witness to appear before the subcommittee.

Mr. Fortwengler discussed a questionnaire which had been sent to all agencies of the federal government requesting "information on such items as name of committee, date of origin, functions--duties, authority, members, staff estimated annual cost, et cetera...." He said that the questionnaire was "...designed to provide information which would enable the subcommittee to develop data on the administration and guidance provided to the committees, the availability of committee minutes and reports, and the overlapping of committee functions."[1]

---

[1] U.S. Congress, House of Representatives, Hearings before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, 91st Congress, 2nd Sess., March 12, 17, and 19, 1970, p. 1.

In his testimony, Mr. Fortwengler stated that the "estimated annual operating cost of the 1,519 committees amounted to $64,647,981."[2] He suggested that this figure was understated by approximately 15 percent because some councils failed to report. He suggested that the actual amount spent on an estimated 1,573 committees was approximately $74 million. He summarized his comments by saying:

> As far as we could determine, there is no accurate inventory of all the advisory and interagency committees in the Federal Government. Guidelines for the management and operation of some committees do exist; however, in many instances there are no disbandment provisions in the origin of committees to prevent the continuance of obsolete committees, nor are there any provisions to prevent the undue proliferation of new committees which may perform duplicate or overlapping functions.[3]

Mr. William D. Carey, Senior Consultant, Arthur D. Little, Inc., and a former Assistant Director of the Bureau of the Budget, appeared before the committee on March 19 and discussed the need for information by federal officials who are charged with policy making responsibilities. He said:

> In my view, government is not well organized to make major policy decisions nor to plan and evaluate their execution with sufficient knowledge....
>
> The art of maximizing the advisory process was developed on a massive scale in the Johnson years, when it took the form of task forces. The term itself suggests a temporary strike force to deal with a well defined problem and then disband. In the beginning, the task forces tended to be

---

[1] Ibid., p. 4.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid., p. 161.

> made up of persons outside the government. Later, when it was not so easy to get outsiders, government people were seconded to the task groups. In the last months of the administration, task forcing had been carried to the point where one could distinguish between first and second class task forces, some of them being the authenic product while others were simply clusters of upper-tier administrators assigned to problems of rather modest priority.[1]

Mr. Carey proposed that all standing committees, other than statutory ones, automatically go out of business at the close of a Presidential term, that a White House secretariat for Presidential advisory committees be established, and that the "President should have at his disposal a fund of perhaps $5 million a year to support independent White House studies and advisory bodies."[2]

On October 6, 1970, seven months after the House of Representatives conducted its Hearings on advisory councils, Senator Lee Metcalf (D.Mont.), Chairman of the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, Committee on Government Operations, opened the Senate Hearings on advisory councils with the following statement:

> The subcommittee has before it S.3067, which I introduced, a bill to broaden membership of the Budget Bureau advisory committees. I hope witnesses do not limit their comments to this bill. It is one approach--and not necessarily the best one, to substantive issues--the collection of information by the government and the processes by which government obtains and reacts from nongovernmental parties of interest.
>
> I should emphasize that the manner of collection of information goes to the heart of policymaking and law enforcement--Congress tends to generalize in its instructions to agencies and commissions. They are told to gather what information they need and are left to their own devices until someone fears the agency is collecting too much--or not enough--information.[3]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 162.

[2] Ibid., p. 164.

[3] U.S. Congress, Senate, Hearings Before the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations of the Committee on Government Operations of the U.S. Senate, 91st Cong., 2nd Sess., 1970, p. 1.

One of the first witnesses to appear before the Committee was Dr. David S. Brown, Professor of Management, Department of Public Administration, The George Washington University, Washington, D.C. He said:

> Few institutions, it seems to me, are as little honored, as little understood, and as poorly used as the advisory committee. It suffers, as your own inquiry, Mr. Chairman, has helped to establish, from a variety of difficulties. These may be explained in part, by the variety of functions it is asked to perform, in part by the failure to distinguish between them. Few institutions are asked to take on such a variety of functions and few are as quick to be criticized when they fail to come up to expectations.[1]

On December 11, 1970, the Committee on Government Operations of the U.S. House of Representatives sent to the Committee of the whole House a report on its findings and recommendations on advisory councils. The committee made 20 recommendations which were classified into four categories: (1) philosophy and policy, (2) reporting and follow-up, (3) federal organization and management, and (4) committee management. The 20 recommendations which were to be instrumental in the development of the language for the Federal Advisory Committee Act were as follows:[2]

1. The Congress should spell out in public law the philosophy behind and need for advisory bodies and definitely establish policy and administrative criteria for their use at all levels of government.

2. When considering creation of an advisory commission, committee, or council, Congress should recognize that much of the exploration of facts can be performed either under the auspices of the standing committees of the Congress or by existing agency advisory committees.

3. In creating a temporary or ad hoc public advisory body the Congress should provide it with adequate guidelines and policy criteria.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 28.

[2] U.S. Congress, House, The Role and Effectiveness of Federal Advisory Committees, H. Rept. 91-1731, 91st Cong., 2d Sess., 1970.

4. In the absence of general statute, the executive branch of the Federal Government should update, revise and restate its advisory and interagency committee policy to insure that adequate administrative guidelines and policy criteria exist.

5. Presidential advisory and interagency committees in existence for more than two years with a budget and staff should secure authorization from the Congress for continuation and be subject to review by the budget and the appropriations process.

6. The President should establish responsibility with the Domestic Council for evaluation and follow-up action, if appropriate, of the public reports made to the President by interagency or advisory groups, not related to national security matters.

7. The President should submit to the Congress within one year of receipt of the public report of an advisory group made to the President his views on the conclusions and recommendations, and state either his proposals and actions or his reasons for nonaction.

8. The President should make an annual report to the Congress, which can be directed to the Committee on Government Operations, on the activities, status and changes in the compositon of interagency and advisory bodies. The report should list statutory committees, interagency and advisory, which the President recommends abolishing and the reasons for such recommendations.

9. The Office of Management and Budget should be strengthened as to its committee management mission. This would necessitate the creation within the Office of Management and Budget of a Committee Management Secretariat. There should be an annual systematic review by the Office of Management and Budget and department or agency heads of the current need for all interagency and advisory committees. This should also include a review of membership and staff.

10. The Office of Management and Budget should help to improve the performance of committees through education and training programs.

11. The Office of Management and Budget together with the Civil Service Commission should study the varying rates of payment per day for consultant members of advisory bodies and establish uniform government rates for comparable services.

12. Departments and agencies should establish fixed procedures and responsibilities for committee management and reporting. Departments and agencies should maintain complete and accurate records of all committees.

13. The Office of Management and Budget should promptly consider the recommendations contained in the annual reports concerning committees submitted by the agencies and departments and should act expeditiously upon them. This should aid in the prompt elimination of committees for which a need no longer exists.

14. A permanent depository within the Legislation Reference Service of the Library of Congress should be created where the public reports of advisory groups would be available. All commissions and committees should be required to forward a copy of their reports and appropriate background papers from consultants to the depository in the Library of Congress.

15. Public advisory committees dealing with public policy issues should be as independent as possible and free from influence from the source of their appointment.

16. The scope of the mission of a committee should be defined clearly.

17. Advisory groups should be provided balanced and broader representation through appointment of members from varying social and economic constituencies.

18. Congress should provide advisory groups with the funds to publish their work when it involves public studies and reports.

19. The Office of Management and Budget with the departments and agencies should make certain that appointment to continuing advisory committees be for a limited period of time.

20. Adequate procedures should be established for the termination of all committees, both interagency and advisory, created by statute or other means.

In June 1971, the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations of the Committee on Government Operations of the U.S. Senate continued its hearings on advisory committees which had begun in October 1970. In his opening statement, Senator Metcalf said:

> Hearings on this subject began last fall. The bill then under consideration was S.3067. It would have broadened the membership of some 16 committees, composed of industry representatives, which advise the Office of Management and Budget.
>
> In those hearings we soon discovered that there are numerous, powerful, industry committees acting as official advisers to other governmental agencies, often meeting in secret. So the legislation which I introduced this year has been revised to

establish congressional standards and guidelines for all government advisory committees and open them to the public. That bill is S.1637.

The other bill before this subcommittee and subject to this hearing is S.1964 which was introduced by our colleague Senator Roth. His bill would authorize OMB to establish a system governing the construction and operation of federal advisory committees and authorize congressional and executive departments review of committees in existence to determine which should be merged or abolished.[1]

As a result of the Hearings in the House of Representatives and the Senate, Public Law 92-463 emerged and was signed into law by the President on October 6, 1972. The legislation which became known as the "Federal Advisory Committee Act" (see Appendix F), authorized the "establishment of a system governing the creation and operation of advisory committees in the executive branch of the Federal Government, and for other purposes."[2] The legislation emphasized that:

1. The need for many existing advisory committees has not been adequately reviewed,
2. new advisory committees should be established only when they are determined to be essential and their number should be kept to the minimum necessary,
3. advisory committees should be terminated when they are no longer carrying out the purposes for which they were established,
4. standards and uniform procedures should govern the establishment, operation, administration, and duration of advisory committees,
5. the Congress and the public should be kept informed with respect to the number, purpose, membership, activities, and cost of advisory committees, and
6. the function of advisory committees should be advisory only, and that all matters should be determined, in accordance with law, by the official, agency, or officer involved.[3]

---

[1] U.S. Congress, Senate, Committee on Government Operations, Hearings Before the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations of the Committee on Government Operations on S.1637, S.1964, and S.2064, 92d Cong., 1st sess., 1971.

[2] Federal Advisory Committee Act, P.L. 92-463, 86 Stat. 770 (1972).

[3] Ibid.

Commissioner of Education and Presidential Annual Reports on Advisory Councils

Reports of the Commissioner of Education

The U.S. Commissioner of Education reported that 18 statutory advisory councils to the Office of Education existed on December 31, 1972. In his comments on advisory councils, the Commissioner said:

> The Office of Education finds that advisory committees are, at times, a useful and beneficial means of furnishing expert advice, ideas and diverse opinions. On the other hand, it is the policy of both the Congress and the Administration to reduce the number of such groups to the level of absolute necessity. The Commissioner intends to use the services of advisory councils and committees only when absolutely necessary to the performance of duties assigned to the agency.

During calendar year 1972, according to the Commissioner's report, three councils were terminated--the Advisory Council on College Library resources, the Advisory Committee on Library Research and Training Projects, and the National Commission on School Finance.[1]

During the same period four councils were added to the list of Office of Education Advisory Committees. They were: the Advisory Council on Library Research, Training, and Resources; National Advisory Council on Equality of Educational Opportunity; National Advisory Council on Ethnic Heritage Studies; and the National Advisory Council on Indian Education. As a result 18 advisory councils were serving the Office of Education at the end of the fiscal year.

In his report, the Commissioner said that "critical examination of the advisory committee structure during 1972 has revealed a need for several modifications." The Commissioner recommended four changes in accordance with the provision of the General Education Provisions Act. He recommended that: (1) the National Advisory Committee on Education of the Deaf and the National Advisory Committee on Handicapped Children be consolidated, and (2) that the Advisory Council on Graduate Education, the Advisory Council on Research and Development, and the Advisory Council on Environmental Education be abolished.[1]

---

[1] U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Annual Report of the U.S. Commissioner of Education: Fiscal Year 1972 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1973) pp. 47-48.

In the Fiscal Year 1973 report released March 31, 1974, the Commissioner reported that the following Councils were in existence at the end of the calendar year, January 31, 1973:

1. Accreditation and Institutional Eligibility, Advisory Committee on
2. Adult Education, National Advisory Council on
3. Bilingual Children, Advisory Committee on the Education on
4. Developing Institutions, Advisory Council on
5. Disadvantaged Children, National Advisory Council on the Education of
6. Education Professions Development, National Advisory Council on
7. Equality of Educational Opportunity, National Advisory Council on
8. Ethnic Heritage Studies, National Advisory Council on
9. Extension and Continuing Education, National Advisory Council on
10. Financial Aid to Students, Advisory Council on
11. Handicapped, National Advisory Committee on the
12. Indian Education, National Advisory Council on
13. Library Research, Training, and Resources, Advisory Council on

---

[1] U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Annual Report of the U.S. Commissioner of Education (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1974) p. 38.

14. Quality in Education, National Council on

15. Supplementary Centers and Services, National Advisory Council on

16. Vocational Education, National Advisory Council on

Reports of the President

In March 1973, Federal Advisory Committees: First Annual Report of the President, was released by President Nixon.[1] In his report, the President stated:

> Of the 1439 advisory committees in existence on December 31, 1972, 251 or about 18 percent were created by statute. During calendar year 1972, 211 new committees were created of which 19 were statutory. In the same year, 187 committees were terminated, making a net gain of 24 committees....[2]

The President reported that $25,215,882 was spent on the councils during calendar year 1972 and that individual council costs ranged from nothing to $1,750,000. The average annual cost per committee in calendar year 1972 was $15,508, according to the report.[3]

In March 1975, President Gerald R. Ford sent a publication, Federal Advisory Committees: Third Annual Report of the President, to the Congress of the United States.[4]

The President estimated the federal costs of operating councils in 1974 at $42,380,636. He also reported that during 1974, 239 new committees were formed and 299 committees expired or were terminated. In 1974, according to the report, 12 departments or agencies had more than 40 committees as shown in Table 2, Page 43.[1]

---

[1] U.S. President, Federal Advisory Committees: First Annual Report of the President (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1973).

[2] Ibid., p. 2.

[3] Ibid.

[4] U.S. President, Federal Advisory Committees: Third Annual Report of the President, March 1975.

TABLE 2

NUMBER OF NATIONAL ADVISORY
COMMITTEES BY AGENCY OR DEPARTMENT
FOR CALENDAR YEARS 1972-1974[1]

Agency/Department	Number of Committees 1972	1973	1974
Health Education and Welfare	367	286	299
Agriculture	172	136	163
Interior	126	129	126
Defense	95	81	97
Commerce	76	41	72
Small Business Administration	66	66	67
Commission on Civil Rights	51	51	51
National Science Foundation	41	43	45
Total	944	833	920

The Status of Advisory Councils in 1975

As a result of differences in expenditures, functions, number of council and staff members, and in reporting responsibilities each advisory council is a unique organization. Several councils have narrowly defined functions such as the National Advisory Council on Financial Aid to Students while other councils, such as the National Advisory Council on Indian Education, deal with problems that encompass nearly every aspect of American education.

---

[1] Ibid.

In addition to giving the year the council was organized, Table 3, page 44, shows the diversity of the 16 councils in two key areas: size of the staff and approximate cost to operate the council on an annual basis. The budget amounts are based on fiscal year 1975 estimated expenditure.

TABLE 3

THE YEAR OF ORGANIZATION, SIZE OF STAFF, AND APPROXIMATE ANNUAL OPERATIONAL COST OF 16 USOE ADVISORY COUNCILS DURING FISCAL YEAR 1975

Name of Committee	Organized	Size of Staff	Approximate Annual Cost
Accreditation and Institutional Eligibility	1970	1.0	$ 40,000
Adult Education	1969	6.0	226,000
Bilingual Education	1968	1.5	115,000
Career Education	1975	4.5	200,000
Community Education	1975	1.3	110,000
Developing Institutions	1970	1.5	65,000
Disadvantaged Children	1966	8.5	190,000
Education Professions Development	1968	5.5	193,000
Equality of Educational Opportunity	1972	4.5	170,000
Extension and Continuing Education	1969	5.5	135,000
Financial Aid to Students	1968	1.5	75,000
Handicapped	1968	1.0	65,000
Indian Education	1973	4.5	230,000
Supplementary Centers and Services	1968	5.0	225,000
Vocational Education	1968	13.5	335,000
Women's Educational Programs	1975	4.5	290,000
Total		63.9	$2,664,000

PROFILE OF MEMBERSHIP, ADMINISTRATIVE AND ATTITUDINAL CHARACTERISTICS OF ADVISORY COUNCILS

A major purpose of this study, as outlined in the Introduction, was to analyze through the use of a questionnaire, the membership characteristics and attitudes of the members serving on national education related advisory councils. To supplement the data received from advisory council members, a second questionnaire was submitted to executive directors and program directors of advisory councils in November 1975. The results compiled from these questionnaires are analyzed in this chapter.

Advisory Council Member Questionnaire

The advisory council member questionnaire which serves as the basis of the first section of this chapter was mailed to 212 members serving on advisory councils in June 1975. The questionnaire and a copy of an accompaning letter were mailed on June 30th (see Appendicies A and B). A follow-up letter was mailed on July 31, 1975 (see Appendix C). Completed questionnaires were accepted until October 1, 1975 at which time 137 had been received for a return rate of 65 percent.

The questionnaire was used to determine the answers to four basic questions:

1. Who serves on national advisory councils?

2. What are the organizational characteristics of the councils?

3. How do council members perceive their roles?

4. How can advisory councils improve their effectiveness?

Council Membership

Citizens are appointed to national advisory councils by the U.S. Commissioner of Education; Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; or the President of the United States. Membership terms are normally for three-year periods except for initial appointments which are on staggered terms of one, two, or three years.

The size of the membership of the 16 councils, the authorizing legislation, and the name of the federal official designated to appoint members is given in Table 4, Page 47.

The membership of the 16 councils, which serve as the basis of this study, range from 9 members serving on the Advisory Council on Developing Institutions to three councils with 21 members; the National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education, the Advisory Council on Financial Aid to Students, and the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education. Eight of the 16 councils have 15 members.

As shown in Table 4, three of the councils are appointed by the U.S. Commissioner of Education, four by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and nine by the President. Ten of the councils are primarily concerned with elementary and secondary education while six primarily deal with higher education.

TABLE 4

THE LEGISLATIVE AUTHORIZATION, MEMBERSHIP SIZE, AND THE FEDERAL OFFICIAL CHARGED WITH MAKING APPOINTMENTS TO NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCILS

Council	No. of Members	Legislative Authorization	Appointing Official
Accreditation and Institution Eligibility	15	Veteran's Readajustment Assistance Act	Secr.
Adult Education	15	Adult Education Act	Pres.
Bilingual Education	15	Bilingual Education Act	Secr.
Career Education	12	Special Projects Act	Secr.
Community Education	11	Special Projects Act	Secr.
Developing Institutions	9	Higher Education Act	Commr.
Disadvantaged Children	15	Elementary and Secondary Education Act	Pres.
Education Professions Development	15	Higher Education Act	Pres.
Equality of Educational Opportunity	15	Emergency School Aid Act	Pres.
Extension and Continuing Education	21	Higher Education Act	Pres.
Financial Aid to Students	21	Higher Education Act	Commr.
Handicapped	15	General Education Provisions Act	Commr.
Indian Education	15	Indian Education Act	Pres.
Supplementary Centers and Services	12	Elementary and Secondary Education Act	Pres.
Vocational Education	21	Vocational Education Amendments	Pres.
Women's Educational Programs*	17	Special Projects Act	Pres.

*The questionnaire was not mailed to the 17 members serving on the Advisory Council on Women's Education Programs because of the relatively short time members had served when the questionnaire was mailed. Appointments to the Council did not become effective until May 9, 1975.

In response to the question, "Who was the first to question you regarding your availability for membership on the advisory council?" 40.1 percent of the respondents said an employee of the Department of Health, Eduction, and Welfare, 32.1 percent said a White House staff person, 8.8 percent said a staff person of the U.S. Congress, 2.2 percent, a member of the advisory council, and 16.8 percent said "someone else." A majority of the members who selected the "someone else" category indicated that the initial contact regarding their availability to serve came from a state education official or the executive director of the advisory council (see Table 5, Page 48.)

TABLE 5

OFFICIAL AND/OR AGENCY RESPONSIBLE FOR DETERMING MEMBERS AVAILABILITY TO SERVE ON A NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL

First Person to Contact Member	Number	Percent
Employee of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	55	40.1
White House staff person	44	32.1
Staff person of the U.S. Congress	12	8.8
Member of the advisory council	3	2.2
Someone else	23	16.8
Total	137	100.0

The length of time members had served on a council ranged from a minimum of two months to a maximum of 72 months (6 years). Approximately one-fourth (26.3%) of the members indicated that they had served less than one year, 24.1 percent reported having served for 12-23 months, 27.0 percent said 24-35 months, 13.1 percent indicated 36-47 months, 4.4 percent said 48-54 months and 5.1 percent reported having served for more than 55 months (see Table 6, Page 49.)

TABLE 6

LENGTH OF SERVICE OF COUNCIL MEMBERS

Months Served	Number	Percent
1 - 11	36	26.3
12 - 23	33	24.1
24 - 35	37	27.0
36 - 47	18	13.1
48 - 54	6	4.4
55 - over	7	5.1
Total	137	100.0

Age

Only three of the 137 respondents indicated that they were under 25 years of age and two out of every three members reported being over 45 years of age. A breakdown of the age of council members is given in Table 7, Page 52.

In 1968 members of education advisory councils were slightly older according to the findings of Cronin and Thomas. They reported that 12 percent of the members were under 40 years of age, 24 percent were between the ages of 40 and 49, 43 percent between the ages of 50 and 59, and 20 percent over the age of 60.[1]

In the 1969 study of advisory councils to the National Academy of Sciences, it was reported that only 3 percent of science advisers were 35 years old or younger. "At the same time," according to the report, "'old' scientists were heavily 'overutilized,' 50 percent of the advisers being older than 50 years, a range that included only 22 percent of the doctorate holders."[2] The report describes the reason for the underutilization of the young and overutilization of the old as follows:

> ...First is the fact that appointment processes... depend heavily on multiple chains of personal acquaintanceship. The better known the individual becomes in his field, the more likely he is to come under consideration for an advisory appointment; and the more favorably he becomes known professionally, the more likely he is to be actually appointed.

---

[1] Thomas E. Cronin and Norman C. Thomas, Educational Policy Advisors and the Great Society (Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institute, 1970) p. 668.

[2] National Academy of Sciences, Appendixes to the Science Committee (Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Sciences, 1972), p. 53.

> Second, there is unquestionably a preference among appointing authorities for appointees who have matured and become seasoned in their fields. It is probably a sound preference, based on the feeling that if a person is to be depended upon to judge larger affairs, he should be expected to have demonstrated sound judgement for a period of years in his own career as it has developed and broadened. An individual's professional and personal reputation among his colleagues takes time to build; and the circle widens with the years, especially the early years.[1]

The Advisory Council on Women's Educational Programs is an example of a council which requires student membership. The legislation stipulates that the council shall be composed of "seventeen individuals, some of whom shall be students, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the consent of the Senate...."[2]

Sex

Eighty eight or 64.2 percent of the members indicated that they are male and 49 or 35.8 percent indicated that they are female (see Table 7, Page 52.)

Education

Members of national advisory councils tend to be highly educated. Nearly half (45.3 percent) have Doctoral degrees and 70.1 percent have completed at least a Master's degree. Table 7, Page 52, provides the breakdown.

Annual Personal Income

More than half of the respondents (54.1%) indicated having an annual personal income of $25,000 and above, 27.7 percent reported an

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Women's Educational Equity Act of 1974, P.L. 93-380, 20 U.S.C. 1866, sec. 408, 88 Stat. 554, 556 (1974).

TABLE 7

PROFILE OF COUNCIL MEMBERS

Background Characteristics	Number	Percent
A. Age:		
Under 25 years	3	2.2
25 - 34	15	10.9
35 - 44	32	23.4
45 - 59	63	45.9
60 - Over	23	16.8
Not Ascertained	1	.7
Total	137	99.9
B. Sex:		
Male	88	64.2
Female	49	35.8
Total	137	100.0
C. Education:		
Ph.D., Ed.D., M.D. etc	62	45.3
Masters degree	34	24.8
Bachelors degree	28	20.4
Associate of Arts	3	2.1
12th grade (high school)	9	6.6
Eighth grade	0	0.0
Not Ascertained	1	0.7
Total	137	99.9
D. Annual Personal Income		
Under $7,000	4	2.9
$7,000 - $14,999	18	13.1
$15,000 - $24,999	38	27.7
$25,000 and above	74	54.0
Not Ascertained	3	2.2
Total	137	99.9

income between $15,000 and $24,999, 13.1 percent indicated a personal income of $7,000 - $14,999, and only 2.9 percent said their annual income was less than $7,000 (see Table 7, Page 52).

In 1970 Cronin and Thomas said "What is interesting about the advisors is the level of their afluence. Over one-third of them earned over $30,000 a year, and fully two-thirds at least $20,000. Their incomes and ages indicate that for the most part the advisors were people who 'have it made.'"[1]

Area of Employment

The majority of the members are employed in the field of education (62.8%). Relatively few of the members are employed in areas such as law (0.7%), medicine (2.9%), media (1.5%) or in the area of cultural resources such as museums (0.0%).

A complete breakdown of areas of employment is given in Table 8, Page 54. In the "other" category (see Table 8), most of the members wrote "retired," several said "farming," and two said "educational consultants,"

Political Preference

Sixty percent of the respondents indicated a preference for the Republican party as illustrated in Table 9, Page 55.

Cronin and Thomas reported in 1970 that 57 percent of the advisors in 1968 were Democrat, while only 12 percent were Republican,

---

[1] Thomas E. Cronin and Norman C. Thomas, Educational Policy Advisors and the Great Society (Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institute, 1970) p. 669.

TABLE 8

COUNCIL MEMBERS' FIELD OF EMPLOYMENT

Type of Employment	Number	Percent of Council Members in Category
Higher Education	48	35.0
Public preschool, elementary or secondary	33	24.1
Business and Industry	17	12.4
Public non-education agencies	8	5.9
Medicine	4	2.9
Private preschool, elementary, or secondary	3	2.2
Home	2	1.5
Media	2	1.5
Student	2	1.5
Law	1	0.7
Cultural resources such as museums	0	0.0
Labor Unions	0	0.0
Other	17	12.4
Total	137	100.1

30 percent Independent, and 1 percent not ascertained. On the subject of political preference, Cronin and Thomas said:

> These "Great Society" advisors, however, can be viewed as at least partially the product of the type of administration in power. In other words, it is not likely that the policy orientations of a moderately liberal Democratic administration's advisory network will be identical to the policy preferences and counterparts selected to serve a moderately conservative Republican administration (although we suspect that the circulation of members and points of view works in such a way as to produce not too great variation). Among the Johnson educational advisors, about 80 percent of the council members denied that the federal government "is providing too many services that should be left to private enterprise." This is noteworthy in light of the Nixon campaign pledges which stressed turning more functions over to private sectors and trying to stimulate social reform on either a volunteer or a state basis. Not so with the Great Society advisors. No better illustration of their views on these matters can be cited than their attitude toward national expenditures for education. Eighty-one percent observed that there should be much more federal money.[1]

TABLE 9

COUNCIL MEMBERS' POLITICAL PREFERENCE

Political Party	Number	Percentage
Democrat	23	16.8
Republican	82	60.0
Independent	24	17.5
Other	8	5.8
Total	137	100.1

---

[1] Ibid., p. 763.

Racial Group

Minority groups are well represented on national advisory councils. Many of the black, Spanish surnamed, and Indian-American council members, however, serve on councils which deal with programs concerning education for special groups such as Indian or bilingual education, or equality of educational opportunity. Table 10, Page 56, gives the breakdown of the ethnic or racial group of the council members responding to the questionnaire.

TABLE 10

ETHNIC OR RACIAL GROUP OF COUNCIL MEMBERS

Group	Number	Percent
Negro American	14	10.2
Spanish Surnamed American	11	8.0
Indian American	12	8.8
Oriental American	6	4.3
Other than Above	87	63.5
Not Ascertained	7	5.1
Total	137	99.9

Council Administration

Orientation of Members

Only seven percent of the members reported that they had not been supplied with orientation materials upon their appointment to a national advisory council. Most members, however, indicated that they were supplied with a history of the program, a statement of the goals of the council, and a copy of the legislation as illustrated in Table 11, Page 57..

TABLE 11

ORIENTATION MATERIALS SUPPLIED TO MEMBERS
UPON THEIR APPOINTMENT TO A NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL

Item	Number	Percent
A history of applicable programs	101	73.7
A review of current operations including descriptions of projects in operation	103	75.2
Information concerning the goals, policies, and procedures of the advisory council	117	85.4
A copy of the legislation	114	83.2
None of the above	10	07.2
N = 137		

Nearly all council members reported that they "had enough understanding of the purposes and problems of the program to be able to contribute to the resolution of broad policy questions" after attending four meetings or less. In response to this question, 33.6 percent of the members reported having a good working knowledge of the program when initially appointed, 41.6 percent said it took one or two meetings of the council before they contributed to the resolution of broad questions, 18.2 percent said 3. to 4 meetings, 3.6 percent said five to six meetings and 2.9 percent indicated that they "still feel unable to contribute to the resolution of the broad policy questions of the program." Table 12, Page 58, gives the breakdown.

TABLE 12

TIME NEEDED TO CONTRIBUTE TO THE RESOLUTION OF POLICY QUESTIONS

Length of Time	Number	Percent
Quite familiar at time of appointment	46	33.6
1 - 2 meetings of the council	57	41.6
3 - 4 meetings of the counil	25	18.2
5 - 6 meetings of the council	5	3.6
7 or more meetings	0	0.0
Still unable to contribute	4	2.9
Total	137	99.9
N = 137		

Meetings

The average member attended four council meetings during the period July 1, 1974 to June 30, 1975. Table 13, Page 59, gives the breakdown of meetings attended during the fiscal year. Assuming that the average meeting was two days in length, the 137 council members spent a combined total of 1154 days attending council meetings.

TABLE 13

COUNCIL MEETING ATTENDANCE

Number of Meetings	Number Responding	Percent
1 - 2	27	19.7
3 - 4	60	43.8
5 - 6	30	21.9
7 - 8	13	9.5
9 - 12	7	5.0
Total	137	99.9

Eighty-four percent of the members said that they "knew what issues the council would vote on" prior to attending meetings. Sixteen percent, or 22 of the respondents, said they "did not know what issues the council would vote (or take formal action) on" before arriving at a council meeting (see Table 14, Page 60).

TABLE 14

KNOWLEDGE OF ISSUES
PRIOR TO COUNCIL MEETINGS

	Number	Percent
Knew what issues would be voted upon prior to meeting	115	83.9
Did not know what issues would be voted upon prior to meeting	22	16.0
Total	137	99.9

Members report that serving on a council requires that they devote a considerable amount of time to reading and writing reports and in analyzing council materials between meetings. Seventy-one percent reported spending from six to twenty-one hours each month working on council matters, exclusive of time spent while attending meetings. Table 15, Page 61, summarizes the responses to the question "On the average, approximately how many hours of outside advisory council work (reading, writing, analyzing) do you do each month?"

TABLE 15

OUTSIDE ADVISORY COUNCIL WORK

Number of Hours	Number	Percent
0 - 5	35	25.6
6 - 10	38	27.7
11 - 15	23	16.8
16 - 20	21	15.3
21 - over	15	11.0
Not Ascertained	5	3.7
Total	137	100.1

Council members frequently express their views to the Congress, President, and to agency officials. Fifty-six percent of the respondents indicated having personally communicated (written or orally) with a member of the U.S. Senate or House of Representatives on advisory council matters, 14 percent communicated written or orally with the President, and 67 percent reported having communicated with a federal agency on council matters. (See Table 16, Page 62.)

TABLE 16

CONTACTS BETWEEN COUNCIL MEMBERS AND FEDERAL OFFICIALS/AGENCIES

Official	Number of Council Members Making Contact	Percent
Visited Washington, D.C.	118	86.1
Federal Official/Agency	92	67.2
U.S. Representative or Senator	76	55.5
President of the U.S.	19	13.9
None of the Above	9	6.6
Not Ascertained	3	2.2
N = 137		

Roles and Responsibilities

Most members say they are honored to serve on a national advisory council. They say they enjoy the opportunities to travel, to participate in decisions that sometimes have major impact on education policy at the national level, and they say that being associated with other leaders in the field is an advantage in their professional pursuits.

Members frequently define their role on the council as being a "supporter" of the program or as an "advisor" to the Commissioner. They also say they were selected to represent a particular constituency such as a racial, ethnic, educational, or cultural group. A large number of the respondents emphasized that they were appointed to the council because of certain qualifications or expertise that they brought to the assignment.

One member who considers his field of employment to be important to the work of the advisory council offered the following comment: "I see my role as providing government officials with the experienced viewpoint of a person who actually deals with their programs on a day to day basis in the field."

Another member emphasized the "watch-dog" role in defining his work with the council. He suggested that his role was to "advise the President and the Congress on the usefulness of legislation passed and whether or not the monies appropriated are spent in the most efficient and responsible way."

A woman serving on the National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development emphasized a role that Congress probably had in mind when establishing the council. She gave the following description of her assignment:

> I see my role as serving as an evaluator in determining the weaknesses and strengths of items and proposals before the council. I do not feel that I was appointed to become a blind advocate or supporter of the programs. Basically: Are the programs meaningful academically? Can they be implemented with rather guaranteed success? Are they financially wasteful.

The following statements are representative of the views of members who represent special groups of Americans:

> I see my role on the council as articulating the needs and concerns of minority groups, in general, and Asian Americans, specifically, as they relate to the responsibilities of the advisory council.

> My role on the council is to advise the President, Congress, and the Commissioner of Education as to Indian education programs, operations and appropriations. Further, to keep the American Indian people appraised of what programs are available and how to utilize them.

> My major responsibility to the U.S. Government as an advisory council member is to give a student's point of view as a consumer of educational services in the formulation and administration of educational legislation so it is responsive to needs which arise.

Only 40.1 percent of the respondents said that "advisor" best described his/her role as a council member. Other responses included: advocate, 18.2 percent; evaluator 13.9 percent; administrator, 10.9 percent; supporter, 8.8 percent; critic, 5.9 percent; lobbyist, 0.0 percent, and not ascertained, 2.2 percent. The breakdown is given in Table 17, Page 65.

TABLE 17

HOW ADVISORY COUNCIL MEMBERS PERCEIVE THEIR ROLE

	Number	Percent
Advisor	55	40.1
Advocate	25	18.2
Evaluator	19	13.9
Administrator	15	10.9
Supporter	12	8.8
Critic	8	5.9
Lobbyist	0	0.0
Not Ascertained	3	2.2
Total	137	100.0

In a February 1971 article, Drs. Cronin and Thomas reported on a survey in which they asked 176 members of educational advisory councils to rank six functions as being "characteristic" or "not characteristic" of the work of the council. In the analysis of their findings the authors report that "council members almost unanimously say they should advise on program priorities and should review guidelines and regulations."[1]

The author's findings were very similar to those published by Cronin and Thomas in 1971. The major differences between the two groups, as shown in Table 18, Page 67, related to legislation and lobbying. Council members apparently considered these functions to be of slightly greater importance in 1969 than in 1975.

Table 19, Page 132, illustrates how members serving on 15 councils spend their time. Members were asked to estimate the time that they devoted to council activities in six areas: (1) the advisory council's internal affairs, (2) program goals and policies relating to the program the advisory council was established to review, (3) U.S. Office of Education activities, (4) legislation and appropriations, (5) reports, and (6) areas other than those mentioned in items 1 - 5.

The council members generally say they spend the least amount of time on USOE activities (11.4%) and legislation (13.2%) and the most time on program goals and activities (28.3%), council internal affairs (21.5%) and on reports (20.2%). Among the activities members cited in the "other" category were project visitations and attending meetings of state and local education agencies.

---

[1] Thomas E. Cronin and Norman C. Thomas, "Federal Advisory Processes: Advice and Discontent," Science, February 26, 1971, p. 771.

TABLE 18

FUNCTIONS PERFORMED BY COUNCILS AS PERCEIVED BY MEMBERS[2]

(In Percent)

Function	Characteristic		Not Characteristic		No Opinion	
	1969	1975	1969	1975	1969	1975
Advise on program priorities	93	91	6	7	1	2
Review guidelines and regulations	93	88	6	8	1	4
Work out new legislation	60	45	30	41	10	14
Make managerial decisions	57	57	32	30	11	13
Work on publicity and support	40	38	49	49	11	13
Do lobbying work	33	17	58	68	9	15
1969 N = 176, 1975 N = 132						

The question was presented as a close-ended format: "There are many functions characteristic of advisory councils. Are the following functions (1) characteristic, or (2) not characteristic of the council of which you are a member." Drs. Cronin and Thomas' results are listed under column heading 1969.

TABLE 19

ALLOCATION OF COUNCIL TIME

(In Percent)

Council	Program Goals & Policies	Council Internal Affairs	Reports	Leg. & Approp.	USOE Activities	Other
Accreditation	32.1	30.6	13.5	2.8	15.2	5.8
Adult Ed.	33.1	17.9	17.1	20.4	7.6	3.9
Bilingual	27.8	19.2	18.4	10.5	11.5	12.6
Career Ed.	25.1	47.0	13.8	9.2	3.9	1.1
Comm. Ed.	47.8	14.2	9.9	13.0	13.0	4.1
Dev. Inst.	17.9	14.1	33.0	15.8	12.2	7.0
Ed. of Dis.	26.7	20.0	16.3	17.2	9.1	10.7
Ed. Prof. Dev.	19.8	19.1	35.6	8.1	14.2	4.6
Equal Ed.	16.8	15.2	24.1	20.0	11.0	12.9
Ext. & Cont.	43.1	12.3	29.0	9.2	6.4	1.0
Aid to Students	40.8	14.6	19.9	9.9	12.9	.9
Handicapped	17.0	23.0	27.4	13.8	17.7	2.2
Indian Ed.	25.1	22.9	15.1	21.0	12.0	3.9
Supp. Cent's.	25.9	24.0	18.1	12.1	13.9	7.0
Voc. Ed.	25.0	29.1	12.1	15.0	9.9	8.9
Average	28.3	21.5	20.2	13.2	11.4	5.5
N = 137						

The majority of the respondents considered their council's impact to have been "significant" or "moderate" in areas relating to: the U.S. Congress (52.3%), legislation (59.0%), policy implementation (75.7%), the Commissioner of Education (78.0%), and other USOE officials (81.0%). The members appear to be satisfied with their impact on the Commissioner and other Office of Education officials, however, the councils' influence on the President and the Congress appears to be much less significant. Table 20 illustrates how the members of 15 councils see their success in influencing government officials and agencies.

TABLE 20

COUNCIL MEMBER PERCEIVED IMPACT ON FEDERAL OFFICIALS, AGENCIES, AND POLICIES

(In Percent)

	Significant	Moderate	Limited or None	No way of Knowing
USOE officials other than Commissioner	42.7	38.3	13.0	6.0
Policy Implementation	37.8	37.9	16.2	8.1
U.S. Commissioner	33.5	45.0	16.2	5.3
Legislation	30.1	28.9	28.0	13.0
The U.S. Congress	20.2	32.1	27.8	19.9
The President	2.0	10.9	34.1	53.0
Average	27.7	32.2	22.6	17.5
N = 137				

Since some councils, such as the Advisory Commission on Accreditation and Institutional Eligibility, were not established to advise the President, it would be unrealistic to expect the council to have a significant impact in this area.

Problems which Reduce the Effectiveness of Councils

Members frequently criticized the U.S. Office of Education when asked to comment on the "most significant problem which reduced the effectiveness of the advisory council during the past 12 months." They also cited such problems as lack of staff, insufficient information to make valid decisions and the practice of delaying the making of appointments to councils.

The members of the Advisory Commission on Accreditation and Institutional Eligibility were especially concerned about their ever increasing work-load. Two members of the council also referred to Congressional and other outside interference in their decisions. The following were typical of the comments made by members of the council:

> the schedule was too crowded, and there was not enough time to discuss and contemplate decisions.
>
> political pressures from interested parties hindered the work of the council.
>
> not enough meetings, lack of time.
>
> The overload of preparation or "hearings" and the number of decisions which an enlarged committee and a limited staff, both at an awkward position in the hierarchy, must handle.

One member of the council suggested the following improvements: (1) more time to consider policy issues, (2) more involvement in developing legislative initiatives,(3) more staff support to follow-through on developing information bases for the committee, and

(4) more opportunity for dialogue with the Commissioner by the chairman and/or small groups from the committee.

A member of the National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children commented on a problem that also concerned members serving on the National Advisory Council on Indian Education and the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education. She said:

> Bureaucratic hassling over council administration with HEW took an inordinate amount of time. We had an efficient, economical system which was changed by HEW to a less efficient, more expensive system and our staff had to spend hours negotiating. This by the way is a yearly process!

A member of the National Advisory Council on Indian Education had similar thoughts about a change in the administrative structure of the Council:

> The most significant problem resulted from placing council staff personnel under the strict guidance of the Office of Education by making them civil service employees. Also, just as important was the lack of adequate funding for council activities.

Members of the National Advisory Council on Supplementary Centers and Services were especially critical of the U.S. Congress in their responses. The council members listed the following among the "most significant" problems during Fiscal Year 1975.

> The most significant problem was the attitude of Congress.
>
> Lack of political base.
>
> The reluctance of the Congress to heed recommendations made by the council for continuing innovative programs in education and the non-existent recognition by the President of these recommendations.

This writer's findings seem to correlate closely with Cronin and Thomas who wrote in 1971: "Despite the fact that most advisory council members feel flattered at being asked to participate in national policy deliberations, many of them are not altogether pleased with the quality of the process. Some express bitter resentment over the quality of the process."[1]

Many members, however, did not offer critical comments about the process, the council, or the Federal Government. Instead they suggested that (1) the council had made tremendous progress in recent years, (2) they did not know of any significant problems, or (3) they suggested that the problems were caused because of the action, or lack of action, of a particular employee of the U.S. Office of Education, the chairman, or a member(s) of the council.

In recommending ways of "improving the council" members often rephrased the problem statements. The following are representative of several hundred recommended improvements suggested by members.

> Prompt appointment announcements. (Member, National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development.)
>
> Careful organization and policy to require serious effort from members and preclude undue influence from staff. Actually the council I served on was in excellent shape when my term expired; excellent staff, strong and fair chairman, interesting and diverse membership. (Member, National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development.)
>
> The council probably could be more helpful if it were given very narrowly defined issues to consider within each of its average two-day meetings. Prior to the meeting USOE staff should prepare and mail to council members an analysis of the issues at hand and also provide the council members with some "pro's and con's" of various alternatives for action on the issue. (Member, Advisory Council on Financial Aid to Students.)
>
> My guess is that most national advisory councils need a much sharper definition of focus, purpose--beyond

---

[1] Thomas E. Cronin and Norman C. Thomas, "Federal Advisory Processes: Advice and Discontent," Science, February 26, 1971, p. 771.

the goal of simply existing, meeting, and going through all the rituals of self-perpetuation and self-justification. State advisory councils, though less prestigious, are probably much more interesting, because they have a direct and significant involvement in the funding, politics and personnel related to the program. On the national level, things are so big and complex that the advisory council is obviously of minor importance in terms of effect. Thus local and state committees tend to be much more "purposeful" and serious and less frustrating. (Member, National Advisory Council on Supplementary Centers and Services.)

More time allowed between council meetings for study and preparation for the group meeting. Better balance of background experience of council members. I would also recommend continuity insofar as it is possible in the selection of staff council members. (Member, National Advisory Council on Financial Aid to Students.)

Better selection of advisory committee members. In striving for minority, group, sex and consumer representation, talent and ability are compromised. (Member, National Advisory Council on the Handicapped.)

To be able to work and meet out in the field, receiving input from various programs and administrations and students throughout the country. (Member, National Advisory Council on Adult Education.)

To work more dilingently toward gaining greater confidence and recognition by those whom the council is mandated to advise and to increase activities in the areas of evaluation and dissemination. (Member, National Advisory Council on Supplementary Centers and Services.)

Councils should not be composed primarily by people in a particular profession. A greater cross-section of interests should be included. (Member, National Advisory Council on Education Professions and Development.)

Better selection of members--higher quality. Better advanced information on what is expected of us at meetings. Office of Education officials should guide committee work more effectively. This deficiency improved greatly the second year. A smaller committee would be desirable. (Member, Advisory Committee on Financial Aid to Students.)

Substantial increases in funding of council activities. (Member, National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education.)

> Our advisory council has been deligent and thorough. I would like to think that somebody knew we existed. An opportunity to meet with the President and/or Congressional members directly connected with legislation in our field would be extremely helpful. (Member, National Advisory Council on Equal Educational Opportunity.)
>
> More involvement of council members at the government level, i.e., testifying in person before Congressional committees, working in concert with staff of the Office of Education on matters of council interest and more contact with the Domestic Council. (Member, National Advisory Council on Adult Education.)
>
> It seems to me that the effectiveness of an advisory council will depend on the caliber of its members. My recommendation would be a careful selection of membership and chairman. (Member, National Advisory Council on Equality of Educational Opportunity.)
>
> The Commissioner of Education provide the proper funding for the council as required by law to be able to provide the needed technical assistance to Indian people as well as carry out its other functions. (Member, National Advisory Council on Indian Education.)

Advisory council members take their responsibilities seriously. It is because of this sense of responsibility and accountability to the Federal Government that members often express their annoyance over such issues as the lack of funding for council activities, the lack of available data for decision making, and the failure of the system to properly respond to the council's recommendations.

The advisory council process, in spite of its limitations, is an innovative technique of getting citizens involved in program evaluation, dissemination of proven practices and programs, reporting, and the development and improvement of legislation. This rather recent thrust in government is almost certain to gain momentum as councils gain the expertise to deal with the very major responsibilities mandated to them in various legislative acts.

Executive and Program Director Questionnaire

Fourteen executive and program directors of education councils were asked to complete and return an unsigned questionnaire in November 1975. Since the National Advisory Council on Supplementary Centers and Services was terminated in June 1975 and the Advisory Council on Women's Educational Programs did not employ an executive director until November 1975 these councils were not included in the survey. Nine of the fourteen director's returned the questionnaire for a 64 percent return. (See Appendix D.)

The questionnaire was used to supplement the data discussed in the first section of this Chapter which was received from advisory council members. The instrument was designed on the basis of the literature, the researcher's knowledge, interviews with executive and program directors, and discussions with other knowledgeable people in the field. A complete list of names and directors of the Presidential advisory councils and of the U.S. Office of Education program directors is given in Appendix H.

Of the nine questionnaires returned 5 were from executive directors of Presidentially-appointed councils; 3 were from program directors of councils appointed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; and one was from a program director of a council appointed by the U.S. Commissioner of Education. All of the Presidentially-appointed council respondents said that the President should continue to appoint members to their respective councils; however, two of the three program directors of councils appointed by the Secretary suggested that the members should be appointed by the Commissioner. The program director of the Commissioner appointed council suggested that the members be appointed by the President.

Several of the executive and program directors referred to the quality of membership appointments to councils. The following are representative comments:

> Would also welcome improvement in the quality of appointments to councils. Too many appointees are without either expertise, knowledge or interest in the fields the law requires them to advise on.
>
> Recommend new selection procedures which would assure appointment of outstanding representatives of the profession, without regard to political affiliation.

Six of the nine directors reported that the chairman of the council was appointed. Seven of the nine directors suggested that the present method was preferred with a two-to-one margin preferring that the chairman be appointed.

Re-appointments of members to councils which have been in operation for more than three years ranged from a low of five percent to a high of twenty-five percent.

Eight of the nine councils use standing committees. Most of the councils have an executive committee and a legislative committee. Other committees include: evaluation, federal programs, government relations, program planning, government inter-agency, research and publications, student assistance, guaranteed loans, and the committee on the annual report.

Most executive and program directors tend to be rather critical of the performance of federal agencies with which they have dealings.

The directors were asked to respond to the following question: "The legislation which establishes your advisory council mandates certain advisory and reporting responsibilities that necessitate a working relationship with various agencies of the Federal Government. How would you rate the performance of the following agencies in fulfilling their responsibilities to your council?" The five executive directors of Presidentially-appointed councils gave the Committee Management Office of the U.S. Office of Education a rating of fair (2.0). Two of the five rated the office as poor (1). The poorest overall performance record was given to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare with a fair (1.9) rating. (See Table 21, Page 77.)

TABLE 21

PERFORMANCE RATING OF FEDERAL AGENCIES AND OFFICIALS BY EXECUTIVE AND PROGRAM DIRECTORS OF NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCILS

	Performance Rating					
	Poor 1.0	Fair 2.0	Good 3.0	Very Good 4.0	Excel 5.0	Avg. --
USOE Program Officer	1	2	1	1	4	3.5
U.S. House of Representatives	0	2	3	1	0	2.8
U.S. Senate	0	2	4	0	0	2.7
Committee Management Office	3	1	3	3	0	2.5
U.S. Commissioner of Educ.	1	3	3	1	0	2.5
Executive Office of the Pres.	3	0	1	1	1	2.5
Secretary of H.E.W.	4	2	1	1	0	1.9
N = 9						

The following are representative of the comments made by the nine executive and program directors who responded to the questionnaire:

> Take the management away from USOE/Office of Committee Management and give councils federal grants to perform duties on federal contracts or interagency agreements.
>
> Would also strongly recommend more complete independence from all Office of Education "assistance."
>
> Remove from USOE active management.
>
> The effectiveness of the council was greatly reduced when the "letters of agreement" were dissolved and committee management (USOE) was given responsibility for handling council accounts.
>
> Make it possible for the Committee Management Office to be truly supportive.
>
> Make councils completely free of agency.
>
> Greater administrative assistance, logistical support, and other routine assistance (should be given) from Committee Management.

Several directors also commented on the subsistence budget that councils, in their opinion, are awarded, frequent changes in administrative guidelines, substantial staff turn-over, and the lack of direction the staff gets from the council. One director commented:

> Would welcome clearer understanding of council's staff to exercise own judgment and clearer understanding of staff's on-going relationship to council. Staff should have better directives from council at beginning of year regarding what council expects of it over twelve month period and, once given, be able to carry out long-term responsibilities under its own steam. As it now is, too often each meeting of council means a new set of directives from council to staff.

The executive directors of Presidentially-appointed councils, almost without exception, commented on their preference for the inter-agency agreement which the councils operated under until 1973. Under the inter-agency agreement, each council received a grant which was deposited in a local bank account--the council assumed responsibility for all payments such as travel, honorarium, salaries, office supplies, and consultant services. Under the present arrangement all payments are processed by the U.S. Office of Education which, according to the directors, results in "long delays and red-tape."

The importance of councils receiving adequate assistance from the sponsoring agency was stated as follows in the report, The Science Committee, by the National Academy of Sciences:

> The supporting services provided by sponsoring agencies are usually crucial to the success of any committee. Often this applies not only to the preparation and presentation of material and to the making of effective arrangements for briefings, meetings, field visits, and the like, but also to the preparation of the committee's report and to its reception and effect within the requesting agency. Services beyond staffing are often required. Committees that deal with unusually complex problems or with those for which information must be collected on a large scale require many kinds of services (e.g., collection of original data, data processing, literature searches) that should not be expected of otherwise busy volunteer committee members. Much valuable time is wasted and the response time in providing advice is lengthened when committees and their professional staffs struggle with logistical problems that should be handled for them.[1]

A major criticism voiced by executive directors and advisory council members related to the "myriad number of administrative changes" the councils have experienced in recent years. They frequently say that a far to great a proportion of their time is devoted to these problems which relate to appointments, budgets, travel orders, and other problems which are commonly associated with the federal bureaucracy.

---

[1] National Academy of Sciences, The Science Committee: A Report by the Committee on the Utilization of Young Scientists and Engineers in Advisory Services to Government (Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Sciences, 1972) p. 21.

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

Advisory councils have assisted the Federal Government since the earliest days of the Republic. Through the use of committees, governmental agencies can call upon experienced leaders from the professions, business and industry, the arts and humanities, and from the ranks of the millions of Americans who are the consumers of services provided by the Federal Government.

Although councils have made substantial contributions to better government, some have been poorly conceived, inadequately funded and improperly administered. In spite of these inadequacies nearly all members take the role seriously and are pleased to contribute to the development of governmental policy and programs. The frustration which council members often feel is related to their determination to contribute and the failure of federal agencies to use councils effectively.

In the President's March 1975 report on advisory committees, it is pointed out that during calendar year 1974 there were 1,242 national advisory committees. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare had the greatest number with 367 of which 17 were U.S. Office of Education councils.[1]

---

[1] U.S. President, Federal Advisory Councils: Third Annual Report of the President. (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1975), p. 1.

The federal costs to operate and support advisory committes in 1974 was reported to be $42,380,636. This amount is said to include "such items as salary, travel, and per diem allowances for committee members; staff support costs (including salary and other allowances for federal employees supporting the committees); consultants' fees; and printing and supplies."[1] Since the U.S. Office of Education, with 17 councils (only 1.5% of the total) spends in the vicinity of $3 million annually on councils, it is likely that the figure is grossly understated. Also, the President's estimate, which is taken from reports submitted to his office, does not accurately take into consideration the administrative support given to councils.

The Federal Advisory Committee Act, which was signed into law on October 6, 1972, has made a significant addition to government because it requires open meetings, provides for an annual inventory of councils, and establishes a committee management secretariat with responsibilities for all matters relating to advisory committees. It also requires Congressional committees to survey the advisory councils in their area of jurisdiction and to seek ways of improving the committee system.

Although advisory committees have been around for nearly 200 years, they are still in the process of evolving. Each council, which is advisory to the U.S. Office of Education, is unique because of difference in mission, membership, budget, and administration.

The value of a council was aptly stated by Professor David S. Brown when he made the following statement during Senate Hearings on advisory councils:

---

[1] Ibid., p. 2.

> An advantage of the professional committee is, of course, that it makes available to government talents which would be unavailable in other ways. Men and women whose professional careers are tied to other institutions and who would not be available as either full-time employees or as consultants can be induced to give several days a year (sometimes more) in pursuit of objectives which they share with government. For their part, there is the satisfaction in being involved in programs of personal interest as well as of national moment.[1]

Councils contribute by questioning, evaluating, advising, and recommending. These tasks can only be accomplished through extensive cooperation between the agency and the council. If the council is ineffective it is usually because the governmental agency doesn't have the know-how to take advantage of the experience, knowledge, and energy of the members.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Membership Characteristics of Councils

There is a general feeling within the U.S. Office of Education and among the staff and membership of national advisory councils that appointments to councils should be less dependent upon the politics of nominees. They also believe that councils should be more diversified on the basis of age, sex and occupations of members.

According to this researcher's findings, sixty-three percent of the members of national advisory councils are over 45 years of age and seventeen percent have passed the age of sixty, while only 2 percent are less than 25 years of age and 13 percent less than age 35. Since councils should be broadly representative of the educational, cultural and industrial resources of the nation, there should be greater emphasis placed on appointing a larger number of younger citizens to education councils.

---

[1] U.S., Congress, Senate, Subcommittee on Government Operation, Advisory Committees, 91st Cong., 1st sess., 1971, p. 31.

In its 1971 report to the President and the Congress the National Advisory Council on Supplementary Centers and Services said:

> Another important segment of society which is requesting a greater role in determining the direction of educational programs is the student...
>
> ...Students can play an important part in the development and improvement of educational programs, and many states have taken steps to ensure adequate representation of America's youth on advisory councils and commissions. Young people are directly associated with the schools and are in excellent position to make a contribution to educational reform and innovation. Full participation of all segments of the community is a requisite if educational reform is to become a reality.[1]

More than a third (34%) of the members of national advisory councils are employed in higher education while only six percent reported working in the combined areas of the legal and medical professions, media, and cultural resources such as museums.

Minority groups including Negro Americans (11%), Spanish Surnamed Americans (8%), Indian Americans (9%), and Oriental Americans (5%) appear to be well represented on councils. One third of the members responding to the questionnaire reported being members of a minority group.

A major determinant for council membership apparently relates to the political preference of the member. Nearly four times as many Republicans serve on councils as do Democrats (60% vs. 17%). This information is similar to a finding of Cronin and Thomas in a 1969 survey of Office of Education council members appointed during the Democratic Presidency of Lyndon Johnson. Cronin and Thomas reported that "fifty-seven percent said they were Democrats, as opposed to 12 percent who said they were Republicans..."[1]

---

[1] U.S. National Advisory Council on Supplementary Centers and Services, Educational Reform Through Innovation (Washington, D.C.: The George Washington University, March 1971), p. 9.

In a population that is richly diversified it is impossible to be totally equitable in appointing members to advisory councils. It is possible and necessary, however, to occasionally analyze the membership of councils to insure that various segments of the population are represented. It is also important to insure that every effort is made to identify individuals who are capable, energetic and willing to contribute to the improvement and development of American education.

Willingness to serve was considered of crucial importance in the report entitled The Science Committee released in 1972 by the National Academy of Sciences: The committee said:

> Finally, we wish to emphasize that motivation is of the greatest importance to effective performance, no less in a committee than elsewhere. If motivation is lacking in a member or prospective member he should not serve. Thus self-selection must play a role in the choice of members of committees. The individual who is asked to serve should evaluate the proposed advisory assignment with regard to (a) its worthiness as an activity in which he will invest his time, and (b) its match with his interests and available time and energies. The sponsoring agency must fulfill its responsibilities in this assessment by providing the prospective member with sufficient information so that he can make those judgments.[2]

---

[1] Thomas E. Cronin and Norman C. Thomas, "Federal Advisory Processes: Advice and Discontent," Science, February 26, 1971, p. 771.

[2] National Academy of Sciences, The Science Committee (Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Sciences, 1972), p. 24

The following recommendations, if adopted, would lead to a strengthening of the advisory council process. It is recommended:

> That greater attention be given to the appointment of national advisory council members with particular emphasis on appointing students, women, elementary and secondary classroom teachers, and representatives of the cultural resources of the nation such as museums.
>
> That United States Congressmen, officials of the U.S. Office of Education, college presidents, chief state school officers, and other officials and representatives of citizen groups and organizations be encouraged to submit the names of individuals for consideration and possible appointment to the membership of an advisory council.

Council Member Roles and Responsibilities

Each advisory council is a unique organization with responsibilities that are somewhat different from any other council. Some are asked to evaluate programs, others to disseminate information on model or successful projects, and others to provide citizen input on critical issues. Each council is mandated to advise either the Commissioner, the Secretary, the President, and/or the Congress on various aspects of program administration or legislation.

The members are not overly impressed with their impact on agencies or officials as Table 20, page 69, shows. Only 28 percent of the members considered their impact to be significant in areas relating to legislation, policy implementation, the President, the U.S. Congress, the U.S. Commissioner of Education, and other USOE officials. Only two percent of the members considered their impact to be significant on the President while forty-three percent considered it to be significant on USOE officials other than the Commissioner. Thirty-two percent of the members considered their impact to be moderate in the six areas while twenty-two percent said limited or none and eighteen percent said there was no way of knowing.

Members are not in agreement as to their major role as council members--only 40 percent said it was advisory while a surprisingly large number, 43 percent saw their major role in terms of being either an advocate, an evaluator, or an administrator.

To ensure that members are fully informed as to their responsibilities it is recommended:

> That advisory council members be furnished with copies of (1) the appropriate legislation, (2) the council's operational plan for the year, (3) a history of the program, and (4) the by-laws of the council (if available).
>
> That new members be given an orientation session conducted by the council staff in cooperation with experienced members of the council.
>
> That the chairman of each council keep the members informed as to their legislatively mandated responsibilities and make every effort to insure that these guidelines be followed.
>
> That councils develop (1) guidelines for their operation which could be in the form of by-laws, and (2) that they establish a written 12-month operational plan at the beginning of each fiscal year.

Termination and Consolidation of Councils

Congressmen write councils into legislation to serve as "watchdogs," "supporters," or "advisors," This is especially true of new legislation which may not have the support of a natural constituency. Congressman John Brademas' (Dem., Ind.) support for an Advisory Council on Environmental Education or Congresswoman Patsy Mink's (Dem., Ha.) support of a National Advisory Council for Women's Education Programs are prime examples.

In some cases councils cultivate support in the Congress to insure that their programs and interests are given a fair review. Representative Albert Quie (Rep., Minn.) has taken a special interest in the concerns of the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education and Sen. Edward Kennedy (Dem., Mass) has frequently been a spokesman for the interests of the National Advisory Council on Indian Education. These cooperative working relationships are often in the best interest of the program, the council, and the Congress.

Most councils are established for a three to five year period at which time Congressional hearings are held and the authorizing legislation is either terminated, extended, or revised. As a result, council members are periodically concerned with the status of the legislation and of the continuation of the program and the advisory council.

There has been a substantial turn-over in the number of councils which are advisory to the U.S. Office of Education. In 1968 there were a record number of 28 councils, in 1972 the number had been reduced to 22 and in June 1975 only 16 advisory councils were in operation. During the summer of 1975, the National Advisory Council on Supplementary Centers and Services was terminated and members were appointed to two new councils, the National Advisory Council on Ethnic Heritage Studies and the National Advisory Council on Environmental Education.

The Federal Advisory Committee Act states that "the need for many existing advisory committees has not been adequately reviewed;" and furthermore, that "advisory committees should be terminated when they are no longer carrying out the purposes for which they were established."[1]

---

[1] Federal Advisory Committee Act, Public Law 92-463, 86 Stat. 770, (1972).

In presenting testimony in the March 1971 House hearings on advisory councils Mr. William Carey of Arthur D. Little and Company said:

> The elimination of atrophied or redundant committees will never come easily. Prestigious committees at the Presidential level acquire, over time, a liturgical untouchability. They outlast Presidents and administrations. If their mission or usefulness is in doubt, the time to put them to rest is in the first months of a new administration. We recall that President Kennedy did this with understandable zest. I would suggest that all standing committees, other than statutory ones, automatically go out of business at the close of a Presidential term unless they are explicitly extended and reconstituted. You could call this a 4-year flush.[1]

The termination of a council is frequently resisted by the membership but most federal officials and Congressional leaders agree that it is a healthy practice. Since councils are innovations in themselves, they should have built-in processes for renewal and change which includes periodical changes in consultants, staff, and in council membership.

A strong case can be presented for a greater emphasis on "task-force" type councils which would operate for a six, twelve, eighteen, or twenty-four month period. These committees would have specific research, evaluation, and reporting responsibilities and would complete their assignments at least a year before the program (legislation) was scheduled to terminate. Committees of short duration would be especially helpful to the Congress and to the Commissioner when new legislation is passed. It is recommended:

---

[1] U.S. Congress. House of Representatives, Hearings Before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, 91st Cong., 2nd sess., March 12, 17, and 19, 1970, p. 163.

> That the U.S. Commissioner of Education, under the authority of the General Provisions Concerning Education Act which authorizes the commissioner to establish advisory councils, consider the advantages of appointing members to short term (6-18 months) committees for the purpose of investigating special areas of national interest with particular concern for making improvements in educational legislation.

Council Administration

The need for a committee is usually clearly stated in the creating legislation, but this is certainly not a guarantee that the committee can perform satisfactorily. Committee members are usually busy people accustomed to working efficiently and productively; therefore, problems before the committee should be properly defined, information should be readily available, and the committee should be assured that its report will be received with interest.

Meetings

The average member attended four council meetings during fiscal year 1975 and more than a third of the members (37%) attended at least five meetings during the same period.

Effective, well-planned meetings are important to the over-all development of councils. Meetings bring together a variety of individuals for the purpose of providing information, analysis, and feedback in addition to providing two-way communication with other educators and citizens in the field. This spirit of communication was summarized as follows in a report entitled the Appendices to the Science Committee by the National Academy of Sciences:

> In a sense the advisory structure constitutes a superuniversity, one in which experts are called upon to teach and learn as they advise on topics on which the nation seeks understanding. The "professor" whose advise is requested--whether he comes from

> academia, industry, or a government laboratory--finds among his students, cabinet officers and Congressmen, generals and White House aids. The nation has learned much from the professors, and the professors also have been educated and stimulated. But we still have much to learn about the curriculum and teaching methods of this nationwide university.[1]

Although the meeting is the chief source of communication for council members, it frequently is a major source of irritation. Members complain that more information or time is needed to make decisions at meetings, they suggest that they should be given a greater voice in the councils' deliberations, and they say that their advice is ignored by federal officials.

The following recommendations are being made to improve council meetings. It is recommended:

> That federal agencies and/or private foundations give support to research projects in the area of committee process, small group dynamics, and the advisory function.
>
> That advisory councils investigate methods of encouraging communication among members, the use of guest speakers and other resource people, and methods of evaluating meetings by using questionnaires or process observers.

Reports

Each advisory council is required to submit an annual report according to law. The Federal Advisory Committee Act specified that "at least eight copies of each report made by every advisory committee, and, where appropriate, background papers prepared by consultants" shall be deposited in the Library of Congress. The Act further specifies that "The Librarian of Congress shall establish a depository for such reports and papers where they shall be available to public inspection and use."[1] The Library of Congress is only beginning to comply with the requirements in the Federal Advisory Committee Act. In November 1975 the reports were not yet available to the public.

---

[1] National Academy of Sciences, Appendices to The Science Committee (Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Sciences, 1972), p. 27.

In 1970 the Committee on Government Operations of the U.S. House of Representatives reported that:

> Many reports are not available. As many committees are created to repeat or restudy the same or a similar issue, it would indeed be helpful if there were assurance that such materials were available. Much effort could be saved. Indexing, programming and retrieval of records has progressed to such a point that a large part of what has been created can be readily used.[2]

Advisory council reports, along with the council charters, are on file in the Committee Management Office of the U.S. Office of Education. The libraries of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; the U.S. Office of Education; and the National Institute of Education do not keep the reports on file.

National advisory council reports are, more often than not, inadequately researched, poorly organized, and printed in a casual fashion by the Government Printing Office or in some cases on an office reproduction machine. Reports frequently are released after March 31, the due date established by law, and are, according to this researcher's findings, usually ignored by policy makers at all levels--the Commissioner, the Secretary, the Congress, the President.

---

[1] Federal Advisory Committee Act, P.L. 92-463, 86 Stat. 770.

[2] U.S. Congress, House, Committee on Government Operations, The Role and Effectiveness of Federal Advisory Committees, H. Rept. 91-1731, 91st Cong., 2d sess., 1970, p. 18.

On the subject of advisory council reports, Frank Popper in The President's Commissions said

> The writing in commission reports needs considerable improvement, most are not read closely, and for good reason. ...distant deadlines might produce better, more intelligible writing by people with literary experience. Most reports should be shorter; 30,000 words is a reasonable upper limit. Some could be as short as 5,000 words.[1]

Although this study did not include a comprehensive review of advisory council reports, it became apparent to the researcher that the reporting functions of councils are in need of vast improvements. Since councils are established to advise federal agencies it seems to follow that their advice should be properly reviewed and responded to by appropriate federal officials and stored in a manner that will permit public inspection and review. It is recommended:

> That the U.S. Commissioner of Education respond in writing to the chairman of each council regarding the councils' recommendations in each annual report.
>
> That the U.S. Office of Education's Committee Management Office draft suggested guidelines for the consideration of councils in developing, publishing, and storing annual reports.
>
> That the library of the U.S. Office of Education and/or the library of the National Institute of Education be designated as a public source of advisory council reports.
>
> That the U.S. Office of Education's Committee Management Office assume the responsibility of submitting all advisory council reports to Educational Research Information Center (ERIC) to insure that they are available to education researchers and other interested citizens.
>
> That councils in cooperation with program and executive directors place greater emphasis on improving the quality of the councils' annual reports.

---

[1] Frank Popper, The President's Commissions (New York: Twentieth Century Fund, 1970), p. 61.

One of the major problems concerning Presidentially appointed councils results from the requirement that councils report to the President and to the Congress which sometimes results in councils by-passing the U.S. Commissioner of Education who is responsible for the administration of federal education programs. A Presidentially appointed council submits a report directly to the President who is responsible for forwarding it to the Congress. This procedure sometimes results in a second printing of a report after the White House has attached a few paragraphs of meaningless comments. It is therefore recommended:

> That the U.S. Commissioner of Education review the procedure that councils follow in reporting to the Executive and Legislative branches of government and recommend improved strategies.

Each council is a unique entity and must be evaluated on its own merits; however, the one over-riding weakness of councils relates to the frequent failure of councils to adequately record and report their findings. A circle has evolved: poor reports, no attention, poor reports... If advice, as recorded in the annual reports, is a major product of councils one would surely question the present annual multi-million dollar expenditure. The majority of the reports submitted by councils are clearly inadequate and may be the major reason for the U.S. Office of Education's less than enthusiastic support of the advisory council process.

Support Services

Advisory councils provide the U.S. Office of Education with the means of acquiring information on a continuing basis. In addition to the advisory function, members serve as resource people or ambassadors for federal agencies since they provide two-way communication between the

Federal Government and educators and citizens in the field. This is a function that federal officials often fail to appreciate and, therefore, fail to utilize effectively.

The U.S. Office of Education could improve its image considerably with councils by strengthening its Committee Management Office. Three out of nine executive and program directors rated the performance of the Office of Committee Management as "poor." (See Table 21, page 77.) Advisory council members were less concerned about the Office of Education's management strategies; however, many members suggested that greater support of councils by the Office of Education would make their jobs more meaningful and less difficult.

Although council members and staff say they need more assistance, they also say they need more independence from the administration of the U.S. Office of Education. Nearly all directors said they would prefer having an independent grant that would allow the council to administer its own funds subject to government regulations and audit.

The importance of insuring the independence of councils was emphasized in the 1970 report of the Committee on Government Operations of the U.S. House of Representatives:

> Presidential advisory groups created by the Congress or the President are necessary to provide independent ideas free of the vested positions of the agencies and their clientele. Department and agency advisory groups in order to render more independent judgments should also be made less dependent on the agency to which they give advice. The members and staff of an advisory group need also to be free from vested interests and obligations which would impair the judgments and decisions of the committee. They must be able to examine programs in a fresh and critical way and reach

conclusions that agencies might not. Separate budgets and research staffs--even though limited, can contribute to the desired objective of the advisory process.[1]

Advisory councils should be as independent as possible from the agencies they advise. It is difficult to imagine, for example, how the members of the National Advisory Council for Career Education or the Advisory Committee for Community Education can be free to fulfill their legislative responsibilities when they use staff of the U.S. Office of Education. It is recommended:

> That the U.S. Commissioner of Education provide greater support and incentive to councils by (1) recognizing the contributions of councils, (2) improving communications between the U.S. Office of Education and the councils, and (3) by sponsoring training sessions as encouraged under the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act.

Although council members and staff criticize the U.S. Office of Education for their "lack of independence," it appears to this researcher that the Federal Advisory Committee Act has strengthened the committee process immeasurably since its passage in 1972 and that councils have acquired a great deal of independence. The problem does not appear to be with the structure, but with the way the program has been administered over the past decade. The problems of councils all too frequently relate to "How do we deal with the bureaucracy?" rather than "How do we deal with our legislatively mandated responsibilities?"

Some Final Thoughts

Advisory councils are an indication that federal officials realize that they don't have a monopoly on information and ideas--they provide the means by which the government can acquire the services of able, knowledgeable, and dedicated citizens at a relatively nominal cost.

---

[1] U.S. Congress, House, Committee on Government Operations, The Role and Effectiveness of Federal Advisory Committees, H. Rept. 91-1731, 91st Cong., 2d sess., 1970, p. 18.

Failure of councils to perform at an acceptable level is usually attributable to one of the following: a deficiency among the members, poor staff support, lack of funding, or a failure of the sponsoring agency to clarify the council's mission. Each council is a unique and separate organization and must be evaluated on its own merits. Most are productive organizations which make available to the government talents which would be unavailable from any other source.

The advisory council role needs both greater cultivation and greater reward. It is sometimes referred to as the fourth branch of government, and, as such, has not received the attention that its importance and influence warrant.

APPENDIX A

Letter to Advisory Council Members

June 30, 1975

Dear Advisory Council Member,

Enclosed is a questionnaire on advisory councils which we hope you will complete and return promptly to The George Washington University, Washington, D.C.

The information compiled from the questionnaires will be used in developing a report on the 16 advisory councils serving programs funded by the U.S. Office of Education during the past Fiscal Year. The information should be helpful to advisory council members and to the Executive and Legislative branches of Government.

The intention of the study is to compile membership characteristics of the councils, review the roles and responsibilities of members, and to consider suggestions or comments members have for strengthening the advisory council concept. The study is concerned with the 216-member population and will not make comparisons between the 16 councils involved in the study.

A number has been assigned to each council member for the purpose of a follow-up, should one be necessary. Information will be held in the strictest confidence. Comments expressed in the questionnaires and used in the report will be used anonymously.

The questionnaire should take approximately 15 minutes to complete. Your prompt response will be greatly appreciated. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Gerald J. Kluempke

Gerald J. Kluempke

jd
Enclosures

Department of Education

THE
GEORGE
WASHINGTON
UNIVERSITY

Washington, D.C. 20006

APPENDIX B

Questionnaire sent to Advisory Council Members

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEMBER QUESTIONNAIRE

Membership Information

1. Approximately how many months have you been (or, were you) a member of a national advisory council?
   (Please place the number in the box provided here.) . . . . (1) ☐

2. How many council meetings (please exclude subcommittee meetings) were you able to attend during this fiscal year (July 1, 1974 to June 30, 1975)? . . . . (2) ☐

3. Who was the first to question you regarding your availability for membership on the advisory council?
   (Please mark an "X" in the box for one of the following alternatives.)

   A. A member of the advisory council . . . . 3 (A) ☐
   B. An employee of the Dept. of H.E.W. or U.S.O.E. . . . . (B) ☐
   C. A member or staff member of the U.S. Congress . . . . (C) ☐
   D. A White House Staff person . . . . (D) ☐
   E. Someone else . . . . (E) ☐

4. The following questions are designed to assist in analyzing membership characteristics of councils.

   A. Please mark an "X" in the box by your age bracket.

   (1) Under 25 years . . . . 4 A (1) ☐
   (2) 25 - 34 years . . . . (2) ☐
   (3) 35 - 44 years . . . . (3) ☐
   (4) 45 - 59 years . . . . (4) ☐
   (5) 60 and above . . . . (5) ☐

   B. Please mark an "X" in the box next to your political preferance.

   (1) Democrat . . . . 4 B (1) ☐
   (2) Republican . . . . (2) ☐
   (3) Independent . . . . (3) ☐
   (4) Other (Please list) . . . . (4) ☐

   C. What was the highest diploma or degree you received?

   (1) Eighth Grade . . . . 4 C (1) ☐
   (2) 12th Grade (high school) . . . . (2) ☐
   (3) Associate of Arts . . . . (3) ☐
   (4) Bachelors Degree . . . . (4) ☐
   (5) Masters Degree . . . . (5) ☐
   (6) Ph. D., Ed.D., M.D., etc. . . . . (6) ☐

D. In which of the following areas have you been primarily employed?
(Please mark one of the following.)

(1) Business and industry . (1) ☐
(2) Labor unions . . . . . . (2) ☐
(3) Law . . . . (3) ☐
(4) Medicine . . . . (4) ☐
(5) Media . . . . (5) ☐
(6) Home . . . . (6) ☐
(7) Student . . . . (7) ☐
(8) Higher Education . . . . . (8) ☐
(9) Public preschool, elementary, or secondary education . . . . . . (9) ☐
(10) Private preschool, elementary, or secondary education . . . . . (10) ☐
(11) Public non-education agencies (including legislature) . . . . . (11) ☐
(12) Cultural resources such as museums, music, literary or artistic organizations, etc. . . . . (12) ☐
(13) Other (Please describe) ______________________________ (13) ☐

E. Sex: (Please check below.)

(1) Male . . . . E (1) ☐
(2) Female . . . . (2) ☐

F. Your annual personal income bracket.

(1) Under $7,000 . . . . F (1) ☐
(2) $7,000 to $14,999 . . . . (2) ☐
(3) $15,000 to $24,999 . . . . (3) ☐
(4) $25,000 and above . . . . (4) ☐

G. Your ethnic or racial group.

(1) Negro American . . . . G (1) ☐
(2) Spanish Surnamed American . . . . (2) ☐
(3) Indian American . . . . (3) ☐
(4) Oriental American . . . . (4) ☐
(5) Other than above . . . . (5) ☐

Meetings/Council Administration

5. Which of the following orientation materials, if any, did you receive when you first became a member of your advisory council?
(Please mark all responses which are applicable.)

A. A history of the applicable program . . . . 5 (A) ☐
B. A review of current operations including descriptions of projects in operation . . . . (B) ☐
C. Information concerning the goals, policies, and procedures of the advisory council . . . . (C) ☐
D. A copy of the legislation . . . . (D) ☐
E. None of the above . . . . (E) ☐

6. When you joined the advisory council, how long did it take before you had the feeling that you had enough understanding of the purposes and problems of the program to be able to contribute to the resolution of broad policy questions?
(Please mark one of the responses.)

A. Before I joined the council, I was already quite familiar with the program . . . . 6 (A) ☐
B. 1 to 2 meetings of the council . . . . (B) ☐
C. 3 to 4 meetings . . . . (C) ☐
D. 5 to 6 meetings . . . . (D) ☐
E. 7 or more meetings . . . . (E) ☐
F. I still feel unable to contribute to the resolution of the broad policy questions of the program . . . . (F) ☐

7. Usually, before arriving at a council meeting
(Please mark one of the responses.)

A. I knew what issues the council would vote (or take other formal action) on . . . . 7 (A) ☐

B. I did not know what issues the council would vote (or take other formal action) on . . . . (B) ☐

8. On the average, approximately how many hours of outside advisory council work (reading, writing, analyzing) do you do each month? (Include in this figure all activities you engaged in outside of council meetings . . . . (8) ☐

9. Please attempt to distribute, among the six areas listed below, the time that you have been preoccupied with matters as a council member. That is, in your activities related to this program, what percentage of your total time as a council member was devoted to each of the areas listed below (total should add up to 100%).

A. The Advisory Council's Internal Affairs
(Total time spent on activities related to defining the role of the advisory council, its goals, objectives, policies, procedures, practices, and activities, etc.) . . . . 9 (A) ☐%

B. Program Goals and Policies Relating to the Program Advisory Council was Established to Review
(Total time given to activities related to defining program goals and objectives, resolving policy questions such as the determination of nonpublic school involvement, the distribution of administrative funds, the criteria for funding new or operational programs.) . . . . (B) ☐%

C. U.S. Office of Education Activities
(Total time spent on activities relating to the internal administration of the program by the U.S. Office of Education . . . . (C) ☐%

D. Legislation and Appropriations
(Discussing legislative projects and appropriations allocated to the program.) . . . . (D) ☐%

E. Reports
(Time spent discussing and/or preparing and reading annual and/or other reports to the U.S. Office of Education, the Congress, and/or the President.) . . . . (E) ☐%

F. Areas other than mentioned above . . . . (F) ☐%
Please list: ______________________________
____
____

10. In your capacity as an advisory council member, have you undertaken since July 1974, any of the following activities?
(Please mark all responses which apply.)

- A. I have personally communicated (written or orally) with the President of the U.S. on advisory council matters . . . . 9 (A) ☐
- B. I have personally communicated (written or orally) with a U.S. Representative(s) or a Senator(s) on advisory council matters . . . . (B) ☐
- C. I have visited Washington, D.C., on advisory council business (C) ☐
- D. I have personally communicated (written or orally) with a federal agency on council matters . . . . (D) ☐
- E. I have done none of the above . . . . (E) ☐

Roles/Responsibilities

11. Which one of the following terms best describes your role as a council member? (Please place your answer in the box at the right.) (11) ☐

- A. Administrator
- B. Advisor
- C. Advocate
- D. Critic
- E. Evaluator
- F. Lobbyist
- G. Supporter

12. There are many functions characteristic of advisory councils. Are the following functions (1) characteristic or (2) not characteristic of the council of which you are a member. If you have no opinion mark (3). Place your answer in the box at the right.

Function

- A. Advise on program priorities . . . . 12 (A) ☐
- B. Do lobbying work . . . . (B) ☐
- C. Make managerial suggestions . . . . (C) ☐
- D. Review guidelines and regulations . . . . (D) ☐
- E. Work on publicity and support . . . . (E) ☐
- F. Work out new legislation . . . . (F) ☐

13. Would you note your council's impact in the following areas as (1) significant, (2) moderate, (3) limited or none yet, or (4) no way of knowing. Please place your answer in the box at the right.

- A. Legislation . . . . 13 (A) ☐
- B. Policy Implementation . . . . (B) ☐
- C. The President . . . . (C) ☐
- D. The U.S. Congress . . . . (D) ☐
- E. The U.S. Commissioner of Education . . . . (E) ☐
- F. U.S.O.E officials other than Commissioner . . . . (F) ☐

Comments/Suggestions

14. What do you see as your major responsibility to the U.S. Government as an advisory council member?

15. What in your opinion was the most significant problem which reduced the effectiveness of the advisory council during the last 12 months?

16. What actions do you recommend to improve your advisory council in the coming year?

Additional comments may be written on the back of this page if you wish.

Return questionnaire to: Gerald J. Kluempke, Department of Education, The George Washington University, Washington, D.C. 20052.

APPENDIX C

Follow-up Letter

Sent to Advisory Council Members

July 30, 1975

Dear Advisory Council Member,

On June 30th a questionnaire pertaining to your role as a national advisory council member was mailed to you. It would be greatly appreciated if you would return the questionnaire as we are anxious to compile the results.

If you have already returned the questionnaire please accept our appreciation. If you did not receive the June 30th correspondence and need the questionnaire send us a note and we will forward one promptly.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Gerald J. Kluempke

Gerald J. Kluempke

jd

Department of Education

THE
GEORGE
WASHINGTON
UNIVERSITY

Washington, D.C. 20006

APPENDIX D

Questionnaire Sent To Executive And Program Directors of National Advisory Councils

EXECUTIVE AND PROGRAM DIRECTOR QUESTIONNAIRE

As you know, I am writing a report on advisory councils/committees to the U.S. Office of Education which will serve as my doctoral dissertation at the George Washington University. I would appreciate it if you would provide me with some information on your council. Please complete this form and return it to me in the enclosed unmarked, self-addressed, and stamped envelope.

Select the letter that most accurately completes the sentence.

1. The official responsible for making appointments to this council is (A) President, (B) Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, (C) Assistant Secretary for Education, (D) U.S. Commissioner of Education, (E) ______________________. 1. _____

2. In my judgement, members should be appointed to this council by (A) same as above, (B) ______________________. 2. _____

3. The chairman of the council is (A) appointed, (B) elected by the members. 3. _____

4. In my judgement, the chairman of the advisory councils/committees should be (A) appointed, (B) elected. 4. _____

Completion.

5. Approximately what percentage of the members now serving on your advisory council were re-appointed after serving their first term? (If council has been in operation less than 3 years, mark N/A). 5. _____

6. Does the advisory council have any standing sub-committees? (A) yes, (B) no. If your answer is "yes" please list titles below:

   ______________________________________ 6. _____

   ____

   ____

7. The legislation which establishes your advisory council mandates certain advisory and reporting responsibilities that necessitate a working relationship with various agencies of the federal government. How would you rate the performance of the following agencies in performaing their responsibilities to your council? Place the letter which best describes the agencies performance in the space to the right: (1) poor, (2) fair, (3) good, (4) very good, (5) excellent.

   A. USOE Program Officer (council delegate) . . . . 7-A _____
   B. Committee Management Office . . . . B _____
   C. U.S. Commissioner of Education . . . . C _____
   D. Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare . . . . D _____
   E. U.S. House of Representatives . . . . E _____
   F. U.S. Senate . . . . F _____
   G. Executive Office of the President . . . . G _____

Executive and Program Director Questionnaire
Page 2.

8. What in your opinion was the most significant problem which reduced the effectiveness of the advisory council/committee during the last 12 months? (Add another page if more space is needed.)

9. What actions do you recommend to improve your advisory council/committee during the coming year?

10. What actions would you suggest to improve the over-all administration and operation of advisory councils (there are presently 17)?

Return to G. J. Kluempke, 3800 North Fairfax Drive, Arlington, Virginia, 22203.

APPENDIX E

Part C of Public Law 91-230

Advisory Councils

"PART C—ADVISORY COUNCILS

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 431. As used in this part, the term—

"(1) 'advisory council' means any committee, board, commission, council, or other similar group (A) established or organized pursuant to any applicable statute, or (B) established under the authority of section 432; but such term does not include State advisory councils or commissions established pursuant to any such statute;

"(2) 'statutory advisory council' means an advisory council established by, or pursuant to, statute to advise and make recommendations with respect to the administration or improvement of an applicable program or other related matter;

"(3) 'nonstatutory advisory council' means an advisory council which is (A) established under the authority of section 432, or (B) established to advise and make recommendations with respect to the approval of applications for grants or contracts as required by statute;

"(4) 'Presidential advisory council' means a statutory advisory council, the members of which are appointed by the President;

"(5) 'Secretarial advisory council' means a statutory advisory council, the members of which are appointed by the Secretary;

"(6) 'Commissioner's advisory council' means a statutory advisory council, the members of which are appointed by the Commissioner;

"(7) 'applicable statute' means any statute (or title, part, or section thereof) which authorizes an applicable program or controls the administration of any such program.

"AUTHORIZATION FOR NECESSARY ADVISORY COUNCILS

"Sec. 432. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to create, and appoint the members of, such advisory councils as he determines in writing to be necessary to advise him with respect to—

"(1) the organization of the Office of Education and its conduct in the administration of applicable programs:

"(2) recommendations for legislation regarding education programs and the means by which the educational needs of the Nation may be met; and

"(3) special problems and areas of special interest in education.

"(b) Each advisory council created under the authority of subsection (a) shall terminate not later than one year from the date of its creation unless the Commissioner determines in writing not more than thirty days prior to the expiration of such one year that its existence for an additional period, not to exceed one year, is necessary in order to complete the recommendations or reports for which it was created.

"(c) The Commissioner shall include in his report submitted pursuant to section 438 a statement on all advisory councils created or extended under the authority of this section and their activities.

"MEMBERSHIP AND REPORTS OF STATUTORY ADVISORY COUNCILS

"Sec. 433. Notwithstanding any other provision of law unless expressly in limitation of the provisions of this section, each statutory advisory council—

"(1) shall be composed of the number of members provided by statute who may be appointed, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointment in the competitive service, and shall serve for terms of not to exceed three years, which in the case of initial members, shall be staggered; and

"(2) shall make an annual report of its activities, findings and recommendations to the Congress not later than March 31 of each calendar year, which shall be submitted with the Commissioner's annual report.

Report to Congress.

The Commissioner shall not serve as a member of any such advisory council.

"COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF ADVISORY COUNCILS

"Sec. 434. Members of all advisory councils to which this part is applicable who are not in the regular full-time employ of the United States shall, while attending meetings or conferences of the advisory council or otherwise engaged in the business of the advisory council, be entitled to receive compensation at a rate fixed by the Commissioner, but not exceeding the rate specified at the time of such service for grade GS-18 in section 5332 of title 5, United States Code, including traveltime, and while so serving on the business of the advisory council away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, for persons employed intermittently in the Government service.

34 F.R. 9505.
5 USC 5332 note.

80 Stat. 499;
83 Stat. 190.

"PROFESSIONAL, TECHNICAL, AND CLERICAL STAFF; TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

"Sec. 435. (a) Presidential advisory councils are authorized to appoint, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, or otherwise obtain the services of, such professional, technical, and clerical personnel as may be necessary to enable them to carry out their functions, as prescribed by law.

"(b) The Commissioner shall engage such personnel and technical assistance as may be required to permit Secretarial and Commissioner's advisory councils to carry out their functions as prescribed by law.

80 Stat. 416.

34 F.R. 9805.
5 USC 5332 note.

"(c) Subject to regulations of the Commissioner, Presidential advisory councils are authorized to procure temporary and intermittent services of such personnel as are necessary to the extent authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, but at rates not to exceed the rate specified at the time of such service for grade GS–18 in section 5332 of such title.

"MEETINGS OF ADVISORY COUNCILS

"SEC. 436. (a) Each statutory advisory council shall meet at the call of the chairman thereof but not less than two times each year. Nonstatutory advisory councils shall meet in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Commissioner.

"(b) Minutes of each meeting of each advisory council shall be kept and shall contain a record of the persons present, a description of matters discussed and conclusions reached, and copies of all reports received, issued, or approved by the advisory council. The accuracy of all minutes shall be certified to by the chairman of the advisory council.

"AUDITING AND REVIEW OF ADVISORY COUNCIL ACTIVITIES

Records.

"SEC. 437. (a) Each statutory advisory council shall be subject to such general regulations as the Commissioner may promulgate respecting the governance of statutory advisory councils and shall keep such records of its activities as will fully disclose the disposition of any funds which may be at its disposal and the nature and extent of its activities in carrying out its functions.

GAO audit.

"(b) The Comptroller General of the United States, or any of his duly authorized representatives, shall have access, for the purpose of audit and examination, to any books, documents, papers, and records of each statutory advisory council.

"REPORT BY THE COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION

Report to congressional committees.

"SEC. 438. (a) Not later than March 31 of each calendar year after 1970, the Commissioner shall submit, as a part of the Commissioner's annual report, a report on the activities of the advisory councils which are subject to this part to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the Senate and the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives. Such report shall contain, at least, a list of all such advisory councils, the names and affiliations of their members, a description of the function of each advisory council, and a statement of the dates of the meetings of each such advisory council.

Abolishment.

"(b) If the Commissioner determines that a statutory advisory council is not needed or that the functions of two or more statutory advisory councils should be combined, he shall include in the report a recommendation that such advisory council be abolished or that such functions be combined. Unless there is an objection to such action by either the Senate or the House of Representatives within ninety days after the submission of such report, the Commissioner is authorized to abolish such advisory council or combine the functions of two or more advisory councils as recommended in such report.".

Repeal.
82 Stat. 1051.
20 USC 1147-1150.
Ante, p. 166.

(b) Sections 1207, 1208, 1209, and 1210 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (as added by Public Law 90–575) are superseded by part A of title IV of Public Law 90–247 and are hereby repealed.

APPENDIX F

Federal Advisory Committee Act

Public Law 92-463
92nd Congress, H. R. 4383
October 6, 1972

An Act

To authorize the establishment of a system governing the creation and operation of advisory committees in the executive branch of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

86 STAT. 770

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Federal Advisory Committee Act".

Federal Advisory Committee Act.

FINDINGS AND PURPOSES

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress finds that there are numerous committees, boards, commissions, councils, and similar groups which have been established to advise officers and agencies in the executive branch of the Federal Government and that they are frequently a useful and beneficial means of furnishing expert advice, ideas, and diverse opinions to the Federal Government.

(b) The Congress further finds and declares that—

(1) the need for many existing advisory committees has not been adequately reviewed;

(2) new advisory committees should be established only when they are determined to be essential and their number should be kept to the minimum necessary;

(3) advisory committees should be terminated when they are no longer carrying out the purposes for which they were established;

(4) standards and uniform procedures should govern the establishment, operation, administration, and duration of advisory committees;

(5) the Congress and the public should be kept informed with respect to the number, purpose, membership, activities, and cost of advisory committees; and

(6) the function of advisory committees should be advisory only, and that all matters under their consideration should be determined, in accordance with law, by the official, agency, or officer involved.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. For the purpose of this Act—

(1) The term "Director" means the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

(2) The term "advisory committee" means any committee, board, commission, council, conference, panel, task force, or other similar group, or any subcommittee or other subgroup thereof (hereafter in this paragraph referred to as "committee"), which is—

(A) established by statute or reorganization plan, or

(B) established or utilized by the President, or

(C) established or utilized by one or more agencies,

in the interest of obtaining advice or recommendations for the President or one or more agencies or officers of the Federal Government, except that such term excludes (i) the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, (ii) the Commission on Government Procurement, and (iii) any committee which is composed wholly of full-time officers or employees of the Federal Government.

(5) contain provisions which will assure that the advisory committee will have adequate staff (either supplied by an agency or employed by it), will be provided adequate quarters, and will have funds available to meet its other necessary expenses.

(c) To the extent they are applicable, the guidelines set out in subsection (b) of this section shall be followed by the President, agency heads, or other Federal officials in creating an advisory committee.

RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE PRESIDENT

SEC. 6. (a) The President may delegate responsibility for evaluating and taking action, where appropriate, with respect to all public recommendations made to him by Presidential advisory committees.

Report to Congress.

(b) Within one year after a Presidential advisory committee has submitted a public report to the President, the President or his delegate shall make a report to the Congress stating either his proposals for action or his reasons for inaction, with respect to the recommendations contained in the public report.

Annual report to Congress.

(c) The President shall, not later than March 31 of each calendar year (after the year in which this Act is enacted), make an annual report to the Congress on the activities, status, and changes in the composition of advisory committees in existence during the preceding calendar year. The report shall contain the name of every advisory committee, the date of and authority for its creation, its termination date or the date it is to make a report, its functions, a reference to the reports it has submitted, a statement of whether it is an ad hoc or continuing body, the dates of its meetings, the names and occupations of its current members, and the total estimated annual cost to the United States to fund, service, supply, and maintain such committee. Such report shall include a list of those advisory committees abolished by the President, and in the case of advisory committees established by statute, a list of those advisory committees which the President recommends be abolished together with his reasons therefor. The President shall exclude from this report any information which, in his judgment, should be withheld for reasons of national security, and he shall include in such report a statement that such information is excluded.

Exclusion.

RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET

Committee Management Secretariat. Establishment.

SEC. 7. (a) The Director shall establish and maintain within the Office of Management and Budget a Committee Management Secretariat, which shall be responsible for all matters relating to advisory committees.

Review.

(b) The Director shall, immediately after the enactment of this Act, institute a comprehensive review of the activities and responsibilities of each advisory committee to determine—

(1) whether such committee is carrying out its purpose;

(2) whether, consistent with the provisions of applicable statutes, the responsibilities assigned to it should be revised;

(3) whether it should be merged with other advisory committees; or

(4) whether is should be abolished.

The Director may from time to time request such information as he deems necessary to carry out his functions under this subsection. Upon the completion of the Director's review he shall make recommendations to the President and to either the agency head or the Congress with respect to action he believes should be taken. Thereafter, the Director shall carry out a similar review annually. Agency heads shall cooperate with the Director in making the reviews required by this subsection.

Recommendations to President and Congress.

Agency cooperation.

Performance guidelines.

(c) The Director shall prescribe administrative guidelines and management controls applicable to advisory committees, and, to the maximum extent feasible, provide advice, assistance, and guidance to advisory committees to improve their performance. In carrying out his functions under this subsection, the Director shall consider the recommendations of each agency head with respect to means of improving the performance of advisory committees whose duties are related to such agency.

Uniform pay guidelines.

(d)(1) The Director, after study and consultation with the Civil Service Commission, shall establish guidelines with respect to uniform fair rates of pay for comparable services of members, staffs, and consultants of advisory committees in a manner which gives appropriate recognition to the responsibilities and qualifications required and other relevant factors. Such regulations shall provide that—

(A) no member of any advisory committee or of the staff of any advisory committee shall receive compensation at a rate in excess of the rate specified for GS-18 of the General Schedule under section 5332 of title 5, United States Code; and

Travel expenses.

80 Stat. 499; 83 Stat. 190.

(B) such members, while engaged in the performance of their duties away from their homes or regular places of business, may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, for persons employed intermittently in the Government service.

(2) Nothing in this subsection shall prevent—

(A) an individual who (without regard to his service with an advisory committee) is a full-time employee of the United States, or

(B) an individual who immediately before his service with an advisory committee was such an employee,

from receiving compensation at the rate at which he otherwise would be compensated (or was compensated) as a full-time employee of the United States.

Expense recommendations.

(e) The Director shall include in budget recommendations a summary of the amounts he deems necessary for the expenses of advisory committees, including the expenses for publication of reports where appropriate.

RESPONSIBILITIES OF AGENCY HEADS

SEC. 8. (a) Each agency head shall establish uniform administrative guidelines and management controls for advisory committees established by that agency, which shall be consistent with directives of the Director under section 7 and section 10. Each agency shall maintain systematic information on the nature, functions, and operations of each advisory committee within its jurisdiction.

Advisory Committee Management Control Officer, designation.

(b) The head of each agency which has an advisory committee shall designate an Advisory Committee Management Officer who shall—

(1) exercise control and supervision over the establishment, procedures, and accomplishments of advisory committees established by that agency;

(2) assemble and maintain the reports, records, and other papers of any such committee during its existence; and

81 Stat. 54.

(3) carry out, on behalf of that agency, the provisions of section 552 of title 5, United States Code, with respect to such reports, records, and other papers.

ESTABLISHMENT AND PURPOSE OF ADVISORY COMMITTEES

SEC. 9. (a) No advisory committee shall be established unless such establishment is—

(1) specifically authorized by statute or by the President; or

Publication in Federal Register.

(2) determined as a matter of formal record, by the head of the agency involved after consultation with the Director, with timely notice published in the Federal Register, to be in the public interest in connection with the performance of duties imposed on that agency by law.

(b) Unless otherwise specifically provided by statute or Presidential directive, advisory committees shall be utilized solely for advisory functions. Determinations of action to be taken and policy to be expressed with respect to matters upon which an advisory committee reports or makes recommendations shall be made solely by the President or an officer of the Federal Government.

Charter, filing.

(c) No advisory committee shall meet or take any action until an advisory committee charter has been filed with (1) the Director, in the case of Presidential advisory committees, or (2) with the head of the agency to whom any advisory committee reports and with the standing committees of the Senate and of the House of Representatives having legislative jurisdiction of such agency. Such charter shall contain the following information:

Contents.

(A) the committee's official designation;

(B) the committee's objectives and the scope of its activity;

(C) the period of time necessary for the committee to carry out its purposes;

(D) the agency or official to whom the committee reports;

(E) the agency responsible for providing the necessary support for the committee;

(F) a description of the duties for which the committee is responsible, and, if such duties are not solely advisory, a specification of the authority for such functions;

(G) the estimated annual operating costs in dollars and man-years for such committee;

(H) the estimated number and frequency of committee meetings;

(I) the committee's termination date, if less than two years from the date of the committee's establishment; and

(J) the date the charter is filed.

A copy of any such charter shall also be furnished to the Library of Congress

Copy.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE PROCEDURES

Meetings.

SEC. 10. (a)(1) Each advisory committee meeting shall be open to the public.

Notice.
Publication in Federal Register.
Regulations.

(2) Except when the President determines otherwise for reasons of national security, timely notice of each such meeting shall be published in the Federal Register, and the Director shall prescribe regulations to provide for other types of public notice to insure that all interested persons are notified of such meeting prior thereto.

(3) Interested persons shall be permitted to attend, appear before, or file statements with any advisory committee, subject to such reasonable rules or regulations as the Director may prescribe.

81 Stat. 54.

(b) Subject to section 552 of title 5, United States Code, the records, reports, transcripts, minutes, appendixes, working papers, drafts, studies, agenda, or other documents which were made available to or prepared for or by each advisory committee shall be available for public inspection and copying at a single location in the offices of the advisory committee or the agency to which the advisory committee reports until the advisory committee ceases to exist.

Minutes.

(c) Detailed minutes of each meeting of each advisory committee shall be kept and shall contain a record of the persons present, a complete and accurate description of matters discussed and conclusions reached, and copies of all reports received, issued, or approved by the

Certification.

advisory committee. The accuracy of all minutes shall be certified to by the chairman of the advisory committee.

81 Stat. 54.
Annual report.

(d) Subsections (a)(1) and (a)(3) of this section shall not apply to any advisory committee meeting which the President, or the head of the agency to which the advisory committee reports, determines is concerned with matters listed in section 552(b) of title 5, United States Code. Any such determination shall be in writing and shall contain the reasons for such determination. If such a determination is made, the advisory committee shall issue a report at least annually setting forth a summary of its activities and such related matters as would be informative to the public consistent with the policy of section 552(b) of title 5, United States Code.

Federal officer or employee, attendance.

(e) There shall be designated an officer or employee of the Federal Government to chair or attend each meeting of each advisory committee. The officer or employee so designated is authorized, whenever he determines it to be in the public interest, to adjourn any such meeting. No advisory committee shall conduct any meeting in the absence of that officer or employee.

(f) Advisory committees shall not hold any meetings except at the call of, or with the advance approval of, a designated officer or employee of the Federal Government, and in the case of advisory committees (other than Presidential advisory committees), with an agenda approved by such officer or employee.

AVAILABILITY OF TRANSCRIPTS

SEC. 11. (a) Except where prohibited by contractual agreements entered into prior to the effective date of this Act, agencies and advisory committees shall make available to any person, at actual cost of duplication, copies of transcripts of agency proceedings or advisory committee meetings.

"Agency proceeding."
80 Stat. 382.

(b) As used in this section "agency proceeding" means any proceeding as defined in section 551(12) of title 5, United States Code.

FISCAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Recordkeeping.

Audit.

SEC. 12. (a) Each agency shall keep records as will fully disclose the disposition of any funds which may be at the disposal of its advisory committees and the nature and extent of their activities. The General Services Administration, or such other agency as the President may designate, shall maintain financial records with respect to Presidential advisory committees. The Comptroller General of the United States, or any of his authorized representatives, shall have access, for the purpose of audit and examination, to any such records.

Agency support services.

(b) Each agency shall be responsible for providing support services for each advisory committee established by or reporting to it unless the establishing authority provides otherwise. Where any such advisory committee reports to more than one agency, only one agency shall be responsible for support services at any one time. In the case of Presidential advisory committees, such services may be provided by the General Services Administration.

RESPONSIBILITIES OF LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

Reports and background papers.

Depository.

SEC. 13. Subject to section 552 of title 5, United States Code, the Director shall provide for the filing with the Library of Congress of at least eight copies of each report made by every advisory committee and, where appropriate, background papers prepared by consultants. The Librarian of Congress shall establish a depository for such reports and papers where they shall be available to public inspection and use.

TERMINATION OF ADVISORY COMMITTEES

SEC. 14. (a) (1) Each advisory committee which is in existence on the effective date of this Act shall terminate not later than the expiration of the two-year period following such effective date unless—

(A) in the case of an advisory committee established by the President or an officer of the Federal Government such advisory committee is renewed by the President or that officer by appropriate action prior to the expiration of such two-year period; or

(B) in the case of an advisory committee established by an Act of Congress, its duration is otherwise provided for by law.

(2) Each advisory committee established after such effective date shall terminate not later than the expiration of the two-year period beginning on the date of its establishment unless—

(A) in the case of an advisory committee established by the President or an officer of the Federal Government such advisory committee is renewed by the President or such officer by appropriate action prior to the end of such period; or

(B) in the case of an advisory committee established by an Act of Congress, its duration is otherwise provided for by law.

Renewal.

(b) (1) Upon the renewal of any advisory committee, such advisory committee shall file a charter in accordance with section 9(c).

(2) Any advisory committee established by an Act of Congress shall file a charter in accordance with such section upon the expiration of each successive two-year period following the date of enactment of the Act establishing such advisory committee.

(3) No advisory committee required under this subsection to file a charter shall take any action (other than preparation and filing of such charter) prior to the date on which such charter is filed.

Continuation.

(c) Any advisory committee which is renewed by the President or any officer of the Federal Government may be continued only for successive two-year periods by appropriate action taken by the President or such officer prior to the date on which such advisory committee would otherwise terminate.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 15. Except as provided in section 7(b), this Act shall become effective upon the expiration of ninety days following the date of enactment.

Approved October 6, 1972.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY:

HOUSE REPORTS: No. 92-1017 (Comm. on Government Operations) and
No. 92-1403 (Comm. of Conference).
SENATE REPORT No. 92-1098 accompanying S. 3529 (Comm. on
Government Operations).
CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Vol. 118 (1972):
May 9, considered and passed House.
Sept. 12, considered and passed Senate, amended,
in lieu of S. 3529.
Sept. 19, Senate agreed to conference report.
Sept. 20, House agreed to conference report.

APPENDIX G

Education-Related Advisory Councils
Established by the President and/or Congress
1956 - 1975

EDUCATION-RELATED ADVISORY COUNCILS

ESTABLISHED BY THE PRESIDENT AND/OR CONGRESS

1956 - 1975

President's Committee on Education Beyond High School, Public Law 84-813 appointed July 26, 1956.

Advisory Committee on New Educational Media, Public Law 85-864, September 2, 1958.

United States Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs, Public Law 87-256, September 21, 1961.

Advisory Committee on Training of Teachers of the Deaf, Public Law 87-276, September 22, 1961.

Committee on Public Higher Education in the District of Columbia, September 23, 1963.

National Advisory Council on Education for Health Professions, Public Law 88-129, September 24, 1963.

Advisory Committee on Graduate Education, Public Law 88-204, December 16, 1963.

Advisory Committee on Vocational Education, Public Law 88-210, December 18, 1963.

National Advisory Council on Nurse Training, Public Law 88-581, September 4, 1964.

Advisory Committee on Supplementary Centers and Services, Public Law 89-10, April 11, 1965.

Advisory Council on State Departments of Education, Public Law 89-10, April 11, 1965.

National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children, Public Law 89-10, April 11, 1965.

National Advisory Committee on Education of the Deaf, Public Law 89-258, October 19, 1965.

Advisory Council on Insured Loans to Vocational Students, Public Law 89-287, October 22, 1965.

National Advisory Council on Medical, Dental, Optometric, and Podiatric Education, Public Law 89-290, October 22, 1965.

Advisory Committee on Administrative Costs for the National Defense Student Loan Program, Public Law 89-329, November 8, 1965.

Advisory Committee on Library Research and Training Projects, Public Law 89-329, November 8, 1965.

Advisory Council on College Library Resources, Public Law 89-329, November 8, 1965.

Advisory Council on Developing Institutions, Public Law 89-329, November 8, 1965.

Advisory Council on Insured Loans to Students, Public Law 89-329, November 8, 1965.

Advisory Council on Quality Teacher Preparation, Public Law 89-329, November 8, 1965.

National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education, Public Law 89-329, November 8, 1965.

Task Force on Handicapped Children and Child Development, Amended July 4, 1965.

National Advisory Commission on Libraries. Executive Order 11301. September 2, 1966.

President's Committee on Libraries, Executive Order 11301, September 2, 1966.

National Advisory Committee on International Studies, Public Law 89-698, October 29, 1966.

National Advisory Committee on Adult Basic Education, Public Law 89-750, November 3, 1966.

Task Force on Educational Television in the Less Developed Countries, November 26, 1966.

National Advisory Council on Educational Professions Development, Public Law 90-35, June 29, 1967.

Advisory Committee on Education of Bilingual Children, Public Law 90-247, January 2, 1968.

National Advisory Council on Supplementary Centers and Services, Public Law 90-247, January 2, 1968.

Advisory Council on Financial Aid to Students, Public Law 90-575, October 16, 1968.

Advisory Council on Graduate Education, Public Law 90-575, October 16, 1968.

National Advisory Council on Vocational Education, Public Law 90-576, October 16, 1968.

President's Task Force on Priorities in Higher Education. Presidential Announcement, October 6, 1969.

Cabinet-Level Committee on School Desegregation. Presidential Statement, February 16, 1970.

President's Commission on School Finance, Executive Order 1513, March 3, 1970.

Advisory Council on Research and Development, Public Law 91-230, April 13, 1970.

National Advisory Committee on Handicapped Children, Public Law 91-230, April 13, 1970.

National Advisory Council on Adult Education, Public Law 91-230, April 13, 1970.

National Commission on School Finance, Public Law 91-230. April 13, 1970.

National Council on Quality in Education, Public Law 91-230, April 13, 1970.

President's Panel on Non-Public Education, Presidential Announcement, April 21, 1970.

National Advisory Council on Child Nutrition, Public Law 91-248, May 14, 1970.

President's Commission on Campus Unrest, Executive Order 11536, June 13, 1970.

Cabinet Committee on School Busing, Created by the President, February 14, 1972.

National Advisory Council for Drug Abuse Prevention, Public Law 92-225, March 21, 1972.

National Advisory Council on Indian Education, Public Law 93-380, June 23, 1972.

Advisory Council on Environmental Education, Public Law 93-278, May 10, 1974.

National Advisory Council for Career Education, Public Law 93-380, August 21, 1974.

Advisory Committee for Community Education, Public Law 93-380, August 21, 1974.

National Advisory Council for Women's Educational Programs, Public Law 91-380, August 21, 1974.

APPENDIX H

Names and Addresses of National Advisory Council Chairmen, Executive Directors, and Program Directors

NAMES AND ADDRESSES OF NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL CHAIRMEN, EXECUTIVE DIRECTORS, AND PROGRAM DIRECTORS

Accreditation and Institutional Eligibility, Advisory Committee on. Chairman: Dr. George L. Grassmuch, Professor of Political Science, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104. Office of Education Program Director: Mr. John Proffitt, Director, Accreditation and Institutional Eligibility Staff, U.S.O.E. Regional Office Building, Room 4068, 7th and D Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20202 (245-2263).

Adult Education, National Advisory Council on. Chairman: Dr. Brent H. Gubler, Coordinator of Adult Education, Utah State Board of Education, Salt Lake City, Utah 84111. Executive Director: Dr. Gary Eyre, 425 13th Street, N.W., Suite 323, Washington, D.C. 20004 (376-8892).

Bilingual Education, National Advisory Council on. Chairperson: Mrs. Rosita Cota, Project Director, Bilingual Multricultural Project, Dist. 1, P.O. Box 4040, Tucson, Arizona 85717. Office of Education Program Director: Mr. John Molina, Acting Director, Office of Bilingual Education Regional Office Building, Room 3600, 7th and D Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20202 (245-9579).

Career Education, National Advisory Council for. Chairperson: Dr. Sidney P. Marland, Jr., President, College Entrance Examination Board, 20 West 64th Street, #25-H, New York, New York 10023. Office of Education Program Delegate: Dr. John Lindia, Deputy Director for Career Education, U.S. Office of Education Regional Office Building, Room 3100, 7th and D Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20202 (245-2284).

Community Education, Advisory Council. Chairperson: Hon. Martin W. Essex, Supt. of Public Instruction, State Office Building, 65 South Front Street, Columbus, Ohio 43215. Office of Education Program Delegate: Ms. Julie Englund, Director, Community Education Program, U.S. Office of Education Regional Office Building, 7th and D Street, S.W., Room 5622, Washington, D.C. 20202 (245-0691).

Developing Institutions, Advisory Council on. Chairman: Dr. Samuel Nabrit, Executive Director, Southern Fellowship Foundation, 795 Peachtree Street, Suite 484, Atlanta, Georgia 30308. Office of Education Program Delegate: Dr. Preston Valien, Director, College University Unit, Office of Deputy Commissioner for Postsecondary Education, U.S. Office of Education, Regional Office Building, Room 4682, 7th and D Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20202 (245-8082).

Education of Disadvantaged Children, National Advisory Council on the. Chairman: Dean Owen Peagler, Pace University, Pace Plaza, New York, New York, 10038. Executive Director: Mrs. Roberta Lovenheim, 425 13th Street, N.W., Suite 1012, Washington, D.C. 20004 (382-6945).

Education Professions Development, National Advisory Council on. Chairman: Mr. Walter Tice, President, Yonkers Federation of Teachers, 35 Grassy Sprain Road, Yonkers, New York 10710. Executive Director: Dr. George Arnstein, 1111 20th Street, N.W., Suite 308, Washington, D.C. 20036 (382-8712).

Equality of Educational Opportunity, National Advisory Council on. Chairman: Dr. Dale Parnell, Chancellor, San Diego Community College District, 3375 Camino del Rio South, San Diego, California 92108. Executive Director: Mr. Leo Lorenzo, 1325 G Street, N.W., Suite 710, Washington, D.C. 20005 (382-7985).

Ethnic Heritage Studies, National Advisory Council on. Chairman: Hon. Ralph J. Perk, Mayor of Cleveland, Ohio 44114. Office of Education Program Delegate: Dr. William H. Martin, Chief, Ethnic Heritage Studies Branch, U.S. Office of Education Regional Office Building, Room 3907, 7th and D Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20202 (245-9506).

Extension and Continuing Education, National Advisory Council on. Chairman: Mr. Newton O. Cattell, Director, Federal Relations, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania 16802 Executive Director: Dr. James A. Turman, 425 13th Street, N.W., Suite 529, Washington, D.C. 20004 (376-8890).

Financial Aid to Students, Advisory Council on. Chairman: Dr. John X. Jamrich, President, Northern Michigan University, Marquette, Michigan 49855. Office of Education Program Delegate: Mr. Warren Troutman, Education Program Specialist, Bureau of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Office of Education, Regional Office Building, Room 4669, 7th and D Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20202 (245-2354).

Handicapped, National Advisory Committee on the. Chairperson: Miss Jean S. Garvin, Director, Special Educational and Pupil Personnel Services, State Department of Education, Montpelier, Vermont 05602. Office of Education Program Delegate: Mr. Lee Goodman, U.S. Office of Education Regional Office Building, Room 2604, 7th and D Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20202 (245-2303).

Indian Education, National Advisory Council on. Chairman: Mr. Theodore George, Route No. 6, Box 6326, Poulsbo, Washington 98370. Executive Director: Mr. Lincoln White, 425 13th Street, N.W., Suite 326, Washington, D.C. 20004 (376-8882).

Vocational Education, National Advisory Council on. Chairperson: Dr. Duane Lund, Superintendent of Schools, Staples, Minnesota. Executive Director: Mr. Reginald Petty, 425 13th Street, N.W., Suite 412, Washington, D.C. 20004 (376-8873).

Women"s Educational Programs, Advisory Council on. Chairperson: Dr. Bernice Sandler, Director, Project on the Status and Education of Women, Association of American Colleges, 1818 R Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20009. Executive Director: Mrs. Jay Simonson, 1832 M Street, N.W., Room 821, Washington, D.C. 20036 (382-3861).

APPENDIX I

Sources Consulted

SOURCES CONSULTED

Books

Argyris, Chris. Management and Organizational Development. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

Bailey, Stephen K., and Mosher, Edith K. ESEA The Office of Education Administers a Law. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1968.

Bell, Gerald D., ed. Organizations and Human Behavior. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1967.

Bennis, Warren G. Changing Organizations. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966.

________, ed. American Bureaucracy. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1970.

Blechman, Barry M.; Gramlich, Edward M.; and Hartman, Robert W. Setting National Priorities: The 1975 Budget. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1974.

Campbell, D.T., and Standley, J.C. Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research. Chicago: Rand-McNally, 1963.

Conant, James Bryant. Shaping Educational Policy. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1964.

Cronin, Thomas E., and Greenberg, Sanford D. The Presidential Advisory System. New York: Harper and Row, 1969.

Cronin, Thomas E., and Thomas, Norman C. Educational Policy Advisors and The Great Society. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1970.

Dexter, Lewis Anthony. How Organizations Are Represented in Washington. New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1969.

Furry, William S. A Study of ESEA Title III State Advisory Councils. Washington, D.C.: The George Washington University, n.d.

Gardner, John W. Excellence: Can We Be Equal and Excellent Too? New York: Harper and Row, 1961.

________. Excellence and Self-Renewal. New York: Harper and Row, 1963.

Janis, Irving L. Victims of Group Think. New York: Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1972.

Keppel, Francis. The Necessary Revolution in American Education. New York: Harper and Row, 1966.

March, J. C. and Simon H. Organizations. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1958.

Marcy, Carl Milton. Presidential Commissions. New York: King's Crown Press, 1945.

Lifton, Walter M. Groups: Facilitating Individual Growth and Societal Change. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1972.

Lippitt, Gordon L. Organizational Renewal. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1969.

Likert, Rensis. The Human Organization: Its Management and Value. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

McGregor, Douglas. The Human Side of Enterprise. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

Maslow, Abraham H. Eupsychian Management. Chicago: The Dorsey Press, 1971.

Mills, Theodore M. The Sociology of Small Groups. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967.

Popper, Frank. The President's Commissions. New York: Twentieth Century Fund, 1970.

Skinner, B. F. Beyond Freedom and Dignity. New York: Alfred A. Knopf Publishing Co., 1971.

Taylor, Herbert A. Dynamics of Groups at Work. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954.

This, Leslie E. The Small Meeting Planner. Houston: Gulf Publishing Company, 1972.

Vermilye, Dyckman W., ed. The Future in the Making. Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1973.

Dissertations

Allen, Fleet Devotion. Advisory Committee Organization, Role and Utilization. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, North Carolina State University at Raleigh, 1971.

Brown, David S. "The Public Advisory Board in the Federal Government." Ph.D. disseration, Syracuse University, 1954.

Johnson, Willys George. A Comparison of Advisory Committee Member, Administrator, and Faculty Attitudes Toward the Functions of the Minnesota State Junior Colleges. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1973.

Periodicals

Cronin, Thomas E., and Thomas, Norman C. "Federal Advisory Processes: Advice and Discontent." Science, February 26, 1971, pp. 771-773.

Golde, Roger A. "Are Your Meetings Like This One?" Harvard Business Review, January-February, 1972, pp. 66-67.

Drew, Elizabeth B. "On Giving Oneself a Hotfoot: Government by Commissions." Atlantic Monthly, May, 1968, p. 45-49.

"Washington Worry: All Those Advisors." U. S. News and World Report, July 17, 1972, pp. 79-80.

Interviews

Ayers, Martha. Chairman, National Advisory Council on Supplementary Centers and Services. Private interview held on June 13, 1975.

Bailey, Ann. United States Office of Education Committee Management Officer. Private interview held on August 26, 1975.

Bonsteel, William. Committee Management Secretariat, Office of Management and Budget. Private interview held on September 18, 1975.

Goodman, Lee. Program Delegate, National Advisory Committee on the Handicapped. Private interview held on November 13, 1975.

Lorenzo, Leo. Executive Director of the National Advisory Council on Equality of Educational Opportunity. Private interview on November 12, 1975.

Mattheis, Duane. Executive Deputy Commissioner of Education of the U. S. Office of Education. Private interview held on November 12, 1975.

McCarthy, Richard. Associate Director of the National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education. Private interview held on November 10, 1975.

Petty, Reginald. Executive Director of the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education. Private interview held on November 11, 1975.

White, Lincoln. Executive Director of the National Advisory Council on Indian Education. Private interview held on November 12, 1975.

West, Robin. Associate Director of the Presidential Personnel Office, The White House. Private interview held on September 18, 1975.

U.S. Government Publications

U.S. Advisory Committee on Accreditation and Institutional Eligibility. "Annual Report for the Year 1974." Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1975. (Typewritten.)

________. "Annual Report for the Year 1973." Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1975. (Typewritten.)

U.S. Advisory Council on Developing Institutions. Strengthening Developing Institutions: Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965 Annual Report. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1974.

________. Strengthening Developing Institutions: Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965 Annual Report. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1975.

U.S. Community Education Advisory Council. "1974 Annual Report." Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, n.d. (Typewritten.)

U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Education and Labor. A Compilation of Federal Education Laws. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1971.

U.S. Congress. House. Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations. Presidential Advisory Committees. Hearings Before a Subcommittee on Government Operations, 91st Cong., 2d sess., 1970.

U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Government Operations. The Role and Effectiveness of Federal Advisory Committees. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1970.

U.S. Congress. Senate. Subcommittee on Budgeting, Management, and Expenditures. Oversight Hearings Before the Subcommittee on Budgeting, Management, and Expenditures of the Committee on Government Operations on P.L. 92-463. 93d Cong., 1st and 2d sess., 1973 and 1974.

U.S. Congress. Senate. Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. *Notes and Working Papers Concerning The Administration of Programs Authorized Under Title III of Public Law 89-10, The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 As Amended by Public Law 89-750*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1967.

U.S. Congress. Senate. Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations. *Advisory Committees*. Hearings Before the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations of the Committee on Government Operations on S.1637, S.1964, and S.2064, 92d Cong., 1st sess., 1971.

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. *Annual Report of the U.S. Commissioner of Education*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1973.

________. *Annual Report of the U.S. Commissioner of Education*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1974.

________. "Charter of the Advisory Committee on Accreditation and Institutional Eligibility." Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, May 7, 1974. (Typewritten.)

________. "Charter of the Advisory Council on Developing Institutions." Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, January 3, 1975. (Typewritten.)

________. "Charter of the Advisory Council on Women's Educational Programs." Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, March 31, 1975. (Typewritten.)

________. "Charter of the Community Education Advisory Council." Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, January 23, 1975. (Typewritten.)

________. "Charter of the National Advisory Committee on the Handicapped." Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, October, 9, 1973. (Typewritten.)

________. "Charter of the National Advisory Council on Adult Education." Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, May 7, 1974. (Typewritten.)

________. "Charter of the National Advisory Council for Career Education." Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, November 19, 1974 (Typewritten.)

________. "Charter of the National Advisory Council on Equality of Educational Opportunity." Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, August 20, 1975. (Typewritten.)

________. "Charter of the National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education." Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, July 16, 1975. (Typewritten.)

________. "Charter of the National Advisory Council on Financial Aid to Students." Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, January 3, 1975. (Typewritten.)

________. "Charter of the National Advisory Council on Indian Education." Wasnington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, October 9, 1973. (Typewritten.)

________. "Charter of the National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development." Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, March 5, 1975. (Typewritten.)

________. "Charter of the National Advisory Council on Supplementary Centers and Services." Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, December 20, 1975. (Typewritten.)

________. "Charter of the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education." Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, May 22, 1975. (Typewritten.)

________. *Public Advisory Committees*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, n.d.

U.S. National Advisory Committee on the Education on Bilingual Children. "First Annual Report." Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, March 25, 1974. (Typewritten.)

U.S. National Advisory Committee on Education of the Deaf. *Basic Education Rights for the Hearing Impaired*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, June 1973.

U.S. National Advisory Committee on Handicapped Children. *Third Annual Report 1970*. Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, June 1970.

U.S. National Advisory Committee on the Handicapped. *First Class Citizenship for Handicapped Children*. Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, March 1974.

U.S. National Advisory Council on Adult Education. *Annual Report*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1974.

________. *1975 Recommendations*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1975.

U.S. National Advisory Council for Career Education. "Annual Report." Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1975. (Typewritten.)

U.S. National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development. "Annual Report." Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, January 1975. (Typewritten.)

________. Gatekeepers In Education: A Report on Institutional Licensing. Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, April 1975.

________. Staffing the Learning Society: Recommendations for Federal Legislation. Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, April 1975.

________. Teacher Corps: Past or Prologue? Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, July 1975.

U.S. National Advisory Council on Equality of Educational Opportunity. Third Interim Report. Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, June 1975.

U.S. National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education. Equity of Access: Continuing Education and the Part-Time Student. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1975.

________. Program Evaluation: Title I of the Higher Education Act. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1975.

________. The Importance of Service: Federal Support for Continuing Education. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1974.

U.S. National Advisory Council on Indian Education. Through Education: Self-Determination--A Bicentennial Goal for American Indians. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, March 1975.

U.S. National Advisory Council on Supplementary Centers and Services. A Final Report by the National Advisory Council on Supplementary Centers and Services. Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, June 1975.

U.S. National Advisory Council on Vocational Education. A National Policy on Career Education. Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, September 1974.

U.S. President. Federal Advisory Committees. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, May 2, 1973.

U.S. President. Federal Advisory Committees: First Annual Report of the President. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, March 1973.

U.S. President. Federal Advisory Committees: Third Annual Report of the President. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, March 1975.